

1306

A Rational Account
OF THE
GROUND S
OF
Protestant Religion:
BEING A
VINDICATION
OF THE

Lord Archbishop of CANTERBURY's

Relation of a Conference, &c.

From the pretended ANSWER by T.C.

Wherein the true GROUND S of FAITH are cleared, and the False discovered; The CHURCH of ENGLAND Vindicated from the imputation of SCHISM, and the most important particular Controversies between Us and Those of the Church of ROME thoroughly Examined.

With A REPLY to Mr. J. Serjeant his Third APPENDIX, containing some Animadversions on this Book.

By the Right Reverend Father in GOD,
EDWARD STILLINGFLEET, D.D.
Late Lord Bishop of WORCESTER.

The Fourth Volume.

L O N D O N:
Printed for Henry and George Mortlock, at the Phoenix in
St. Paul's Church-yard. 1709.

A Rational Account
OF THE
GROUNDS
OF
Protestant Religion:
BEING A
VINDICATION

OF THE
Lord Archbishop of Canterbury's
Relation of the Conference, &c.
From the pretended Answer by W.C.

Wherein the true GROUNDS of FAITH are stated, and the
Falsities thereof: The Church of England is vindicated from
the imputation of heresy, and the most important passages of
Scripture are explained, and the Church of Rome is brought
to the test.

By A. R. to Mr. J. J. his third Answer, containing
a plain and full vindication on this Book.

By the Right Honourable the Lord in GOD,
JAMES OGLETHORPE, DD.
Late Lord Bishop of WORCESTER.



The Fourth Edition.
LONDON:
Printed for Henry and George Woodcock, at the Swan in
St. Paul's Church-yard, 1703.

TO HIS MOST
Sacred Majesty
CHARLES II.

By the Grace of God King of Great
BRITAIN, FRANCE, and IRELAND;
Defender of the Faith, &c.

Most Gracious Sovereign,

SINCE that great Miracle of *Divine Providence* in Your Majesty's most happy *Restoration*, we have seen those who before Triumphed over the *Church of England* as dead, as much expressing their Envy at her *Resurrection*. Neither could it otherwise be expected, but that so sudden a recovery of her former *Lustre*, would open the mouths of her weak but contentious *Adversaries*, who see her shine in a *Firmament* so much above them. But it is a part of her present *Felicity*, that they are ashamed

A 2 of

The Epistle DEDICATORY.

of that insulting Question, *What is become of your Church now?* and are driven back to their old impertinency, *Where was your Church before Luther?* They might as well alter the date of it, and ask *Where she was before your Majesty's Restauration?* For she only suffered an *Eclipse* in the late Confusion; no more did she, though of a longer stay, in the times before the *Reformation*. And it was her great *Honour*, that she was not awakened out of it (as of old they fancy'd) by the *beating of Drums*, or the rude *clamours* of the *People*; but as she Gradually regained her *Light*, so it was with the *Influence of Supreme Authority*. Which hath caused so close an union and combination of *Interests* between them, that the *Church of England*, and the *Royal Family*, have like *Hippocrates* his *Twins* both *wept* and *rejoyc'd* together. And nothing doth more argue the excellent Constitution of our *Church*, than that therein the purity of *Christian Doctrine* is joyned with the most hearty Acknowledgment of your *Majesty's Power* and *Supremacy*. So that the *Loyalty* of the Members of it can neither be suspected of private Interest, or of depending on the pleasure of a *Foreign Bishop*, but is inlaid in the very *Foundations* of our *Reformation*. Which stands on those two *Grand Principles* of *Religion* and *Government*; The giving to God the things that are God's, and to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's. And as long as these two remain unshaken, we need not fear the continuance and flourishing of the *Reformed Church of England*, and your *Majesty's Interest* in the Members of it. Which it is hard to conceive

The Epistle DEDICATORY.

ceive those can have any Zeal for, who are the busie *Factors* among us for promoting so opposite an *Interest* as that of the *Church* of *Rome*. For what a Contradiction is it, to suppose it consistent with your *Majesty's Honour* and *Interest*, to rob your *Imperial Crown* of one of the richest *Jewels* of it, to expose your *Royal Scepter* to the mercy of a *Foreign Prelate*, to have another *Supreme Head* acknowledged within your *Dominions*, and thereby to cut off the dependance of a considerable part of the Nation wholly from *Your Self*, and to exhaust the *Nation* of an Infinite *Mass* of *Treasure* meerly to support the *Grandeur* of the *See of Rome*? They who can make Men believe that these things tend to *Your Majesty's Service*, think they have gained thereby a considerable step to their *Religion*, which is by baffling Mens Reason, and perswading them to believe Contradictions. But if, notwithstanding the received Principles of their *Church*, any have continued Faithful in their Loyalty to *Your Majesty*, we have much more cause to attribute it to their *Love* to their *King* and *Country*, than to their *Religion*. We deny not, but there may be such rare *Tempers* which may conquer the malignity of *Poison*, but it would be a dangerous *Inference* from thence, that it ought not to be accounted hurtful to *Humane Nature*. If any such have been truly *Loyal*, may they continue so, and their number increase: and since therein they so much come off from themselves, we hope they may yet come nearer to us, whose *Religion* tends as much to the settling the only sure *Foundations* of *Loyalty*, as theirs doth to the

a

weak-

The Epistle DEDICATORY.

weakning of them. And were this the only Controversie between us, there need not many Books be written to perswade Men of the Truth of it.

But if these Men may be believed, we can as little please *God* on the Principles of our *Church*, as they *Your Majesty* on the Principles of theirs. A strange Assertion! and impossible to be entertain'd by any but those who think there is no such way to please *God*, as to renounce the judgment of Sense and Reason. And then indeed we freely confess there are none so likely to do it, as themselves. With whom Men are equally bound to believe the greatest *Repugnancies* to Sense and Reason, with the most *Fundamental Verities* of *Christian Faith*. As though no *Faith* could carry Men to Heaven, but that which can, not only *remove*, but *swallow Mountains*. Yet these are the Persons who pretend to make our *Faith Infallible*, while they undermine the *Foundations* of it, as they advance *Charity* by denying *Salvation* to all but themselves, and promote true *Piety* by their gross *Superstitions*. By all which they have been guilty of *debauching Christianity* in so high a measure, that it cannot but heartily grieve those who honour it as the most excellent *Religion* in the World, to see its *beauty* so much *clouded* by the *Errors* and *Superstitions* of the *Roman Church*.

That these are *great* as well as *sad Truths*, is the design of the ensuing Book to discover. Which I humbly present to *Your Majesty's Hands*,
both

The Epistle DEDICATORY.

both as it is a *Defence* of that *Cause* wherein *Your Interest* is so highly concern'd, and of that *Book* which *Your Royal Father* of most *Glorious Memory*, so highly honoured, not only by his own perusal and approbation, but by the commendation of it to his *Dearest Children*. On which account, I am more encouraged to hope for your *Majesty's* acceptance of this, because it appears under the *Shadow*, as well as for the *Defence*, of so great a *Name*. And since *God* hath blessed *Your Majesty* with so happy and rare a mixture, of *Power*, and *Sweetness of Temper*, May they be still employed in the *Love* and *Defence* of our *Reformed Church*; which is the hearty Prayer of

Your Majesty's most Loyal

and Obedient Subject,

E. STILLINGFLEET.

The Epistle

both as it is a Defence of that City wherein I am
lived, is to highly commend the good of that City
which I am living in, of most Christian Liberty
to highly honoured, not only by his own praise
but and approbation, but by the commendation
of all other Christian Cities. On which account
I am more encouraged to hope for your favour
the acceptance of this, because it appears under
the shadow, as well as for the Defence, of to great
a cause. And that God hath blessed the good
will to his people and the Christian City of London
and the Church of England, may they be still im-
ployed in the Lord and Defence of our beloved
Church, which is the glory of Christ.

Yours Majesty's most loyal

and obedient Subject,

H. STURGEON

THE

THE PREFACE TO THE READER.

IT is now about a twelve-month, since there appeared to the World a Book, under the Title of *Dr. Laud's Labyrinth*; but, with the usual sincerity of those Persons, pretended to be Printed some Years before. It is not the business of this Preface to enquire, Why if Printed then, it remained so long unpublished, but to acquaint the Reader with the scope and design of that Book, and of this which comes forth as a Reply to it. There are three Things mainly in Dispute between us, and those of the *Church of Rome*, viz. Whether they, or we, give the more satisfactory account of the *Grounds of Faith*? Whether their *Church*, or *ours*, be guilty of the charge of *Schism*? And, Whether their *Church* be justly accused by us of introducing many *Errors and Superstitions*? In the handling of these, all our present Debate consists; and therefore, for the greater Advantage of the Reader, I have distributed the whole into three distinct Parts: which I thought more commodious, than carrying it on in one continued Discourse. And, lest our *Adversaries* should complain, that we still proceed in a destructive way, I have not only endeavoured to lay open the palpable weakness of their Cause, but to give a rational account of our own Doctrine in opposition to theirs. Which I have especially done in the
great

The Preface to the Reader.

great Controversie of the *Resolution of Faith*, as being the most difficult and important of any other. I hope the Reader will have no cause to blame me for false or impertinent Allegations of the *Fathers*, since it hath been so much my business to discover the fraud of our *Adversaries* in that particular: which I have chiefly done from the scope and design of those very Books, out of which their testimonies are produced. In many of the particular Differences, I have made use of several of their late Writers against themselves; both to let them see, how much *Popery* begins to grow weary of itself; and, how unjustly they condemn us for denying those things, which the moderate and rational Men of their own side disown, and dispute against as well as we; and chiefly to undeceive the World, as to their great pretence of *Unity* among themselves. Since their Divisions are grown to so great a height both at home and in Foreign Parts, that the Dissenting Parties mutually charge each other with *Herésie*, and that about their great Foundation of Faith, viz. the *Popes Infallibility*; The *Janse-nists* in *France*, and a growing party in *England*, charging the *Jesuits* with *Herésie* in asserting it, as they do them with the same for denying it. As to myself, I only declare, that I have with freedom and impartiality enquired into the Reasons on both sides, and no Interest hath kept me from letting that side of the ballance fall, where I saw the greater weight of Reason. In which respect, I have been so far from dissembling the force of any of our *Adversaries* Arguments, that if I could add greater weight to them, I have done it; being as unwilling to abuse myself as the world. And therefore I have not only consulted their greatest Authors, especially the three famous *Cardinals*, *Baronius*, *Bellarmin*, and *Perron*, but the chiefest of those, who, under the name of *Conciliators*, have put the fairest Varnish on the Doctrine of that Church. However, I have kept close to my *Adversary*, and followed him through all his windings, from which I return with this satisfaction to myself, that I have vindicated his *Lordship* and *Truth* together. As to the style and way of writing I use, all that I have to say, is that my design hath been to joyn clearness of Expression, with evidence of Reason. What success I have had in it, must be left to the Reader's judgment; I only desire him to lay aside *prejudice* as much in judging, as I have done in writing; otherwise I despair of his doing me right, and of my doing him good. For, though reason be tractable and ingenuous, yet Prejudice and Interest are invincible things.

Having

The Preface to the Reader.

Having done thus much by way of Preface, I shall not detain thee longer, by a particular Answer to the impertinencies of our *Author's* Preface, since there is nothing contained therein, but what is abundantly answered in a more proper place. And I cannot think it reasonable to abuse so much the Readers *Appetite*, as to give him a tedious *Preface* to cloy his Stomach. If any, after perusal of the whole, shall think fit to return an Answer, if they do it fairly and rationally, they shall receive the same civility; if with clamour and impertinency, I only let them know, I have not leisure enough to kill *Flyes*, though they make a troublesome noise. If any service be done to *God* or the *Church*, by this present Work, next to that *Divine Assistance*, through which I have done it, thou owest it to those great Pillars of our *Church*, by whose Command and Encouragement I undertook it. Who the Author was of the Book, I answer, I have been the less solicitous to enquire, because I would not betray the weakness of my Cause, by mixing personal matters in Debates of so great importance. And, whether he be now living, or dead, I suppose our *Adversaries* cannot think it at all material, unless they judge that their Cause doth live and dye with him.

196
10
45



PART I.

Of the Grounds of Faith.

196:1:9:
107:1:0:
45:1:0:

CHAP. I.

The Occasion of the Conference, and Defence of the Greek Church.

T. C's. Title examined and retorted. *The Labyrinth found in his Book and Doctrine. The occasion of the Conference about the Churches Infallibility. The rise of the Dispute about the Greek Church, and the Consequences from it. The Charge of Heresie against the Greek Church examined, and she found, Not-guilty, by the concurrent Testimony of Fathers, General Councils, and Popes. Of the Council of Florence and the Proceedings there; That Council neither General nor Free. The distinction of Ancient and Modern Greeks disproved. The Debate of the Filioque being inserted into the Creed. The time when, and the Right by which it was done, discussed. The rise of the Schism between the Eastern and Western Churches, mainly occasioned by the Church of Rome.*



That which is the common Subtilty of Malefactors, to derive, if possible, the imputation of that Fault on the persons of their Accusers, which they are most liable to be charged with themselves, is the great Artifice made use of by you in the *Title and Design* of your Book. For there being nothing which your Party is more justly accused for, than involving and perplexing the Grounds of Christian Faith under a Pretext of Infallibility in your Church, you thought you could not better avoid the *Odium* of it, than by a confident recrimination: And from hence it is that you call his Lordships Book a *Labyrinth*, and pretend to discover his *abstruse turnings, ambiguous windings and intricate Meanders*, as you are pleased to stile them. But those who will take the pains to search your Book for the *discoveries* made in it, will find themselves little satisfied but only in *these*, that no cause can be so bad, but interested Persons will plead for it; and no writing so clear and exact, but a perplexed Mind will imagine nothing but *Meanders* in it. And if dark passages and intricate windings, if obscure sense and perplexed

§. I.

consequences, if uncertain wandrings and frequent self-contradictions may make a writing be call'd a *Labyrinth*, I know no Modern *Artist* who comes so near the skill of the *Cretan Artificer* as your self. Neither is this merely your own fault; but the nature of the *Cause* whose Defence you have espoused, is such, as will not admit of being handled in any other manner. For you might as soon hope to perswade a Traveller that his nearest and safest way was through such a *Labyrinth* as that of *Creet*, as convince us that the best and surest Resolution of our Faith is into your *Churches Infallibility*. And while you give out, that all other Grounds of *Christian Faith* are uncertain, and yet are put to such miserable shifts in defence of your own, instead of establishing the Faith of *Christians*, you expose *Christianity* it self to the Scorn and Contempt of *Atheists*; who need nothing more to confirm them in their *Infidelity*, than such a senseless and unreasonable way of proceeding as you make use of, for laying the Foundations of *Christian Faith*. Your great Principle being, that no Faith can be Divine, but what is Infallible; and none Infallible, but what is built on a Divine and Infallible Testimony; and that this Testimony is only that of the present Catholick Church; and that Church none but yours: And yet after all this you dare not say the Testimony of your Church is *Divine*, but only *in a sort* and *after a manner*. You pretend that our Faith is vain and uncertain, because built only on Moral Certainty and Rational Evidence; and yet you have no other Proof for your Churches Infallibility, but the motives of Credibility. You offer to prove the Churches Infallibility independently on *Scripture*; and yet challenge no other Infallibility but what comes by the promise and assistance of the *Holy Ghost*, which depends wholly on the Truth of the *Scripture*. You seek to disparage *Scripture* on purpose to advance your *Churches Authority*, and yet bring your greatest Evidences of the *Churches Authority* from it. By which *Authority* of the *Church* you often tell us that *Christian Religion* can only be proved to be Infallibly true, when if but one error be found in your *Church*, her Infallible Testimony is gone, and what becomes then of *Christian Religion*? And all this is managed with a peculiar regard to the Interest of *your Church*, as the only *Catholick Church*, which you can never attempt to prove but upon supposition of the *Truth of Christianity*, the belief of which yet you say depends upon your *Churches* being the *True and Catholick Church*. These, and many other such as these will be found the rare and coherent Principles of your Faith and Doctrine, which I have here only given this taste of, that the Reader may see with what honour to your self and advantage to your Cause, you have bestowed the Title of *Labyrinth* on his *Lordships Book*.

But yet you might be pardonable, if rather through the weakness of your Cause, than your ill management of it, you had brought us into these amazing *Labyrinths*; if you had left us any thing whereby we might hope to be safely directed in our passage through them: Whereas you not only endeavour to put Men out of the true Way, but use your greatest Industry to keep them from a possibility of returning into it: By not only suggesting false Principles to them, but decrying the use of those things which should discover their Falsity. For although the judgment of Sense were that which the *Apostles* did appeal to (*that which we have seen and heard*—declare we unto you) although that were the greatest and surest evidence to them of the *Resurrection of Christ*; although *Christ* himself condemned them for their unbelief and hardness of heart, because they believed not them which had seen him after he was risen; yet according to your Principles, Men must have a care of relying on the judgment of sense in Matters

1 John 1.
1, 3.

Mark 16.
14.

ters of Faith, lest perchance, they should not believe that great *Affront* to humane Nature, the Doctrine of *Transubstantiation*. Neither are Men only deprived of the judgment of Sense, but of the concurrent use of *Scripture* and *Reason*; for these are pretended to be uncertain, fallible, nay, dangerous without the Churches Infallibility: So that the short of your Grounds of establishing Faith, is, If we will find our way, we must renounce the Judgment of Sense and Reason, submit our selves and *Scripture* to an *Infallible Guide*, and then you tell us we cannot miss of our way; when it is impossible for us to know our *Guide*, without the use of those things which we are bid to renounce. These things laid together make us admire more at your *Confidence* than *Invention* in making the current Title of your Book to be Dr. *Laud's Labyrinth*, in which it is hard to say, whether your Immodesty or Blindness be the greater.

But as though you were the only *Heroes* for asserting the *Christian Cause*, and all others but more *subtle betrayers* of it, you begin your Book with a most ingenious comparison of the learned labours of those of your Church to the stately Temple of Solomon; and the artificial, but pestiferous Works of all Heretical Authors (i. e. all but your selves) to *Labyrinths* and intricate Dungeons. In which only your Discretion is to be commended, in placing this at the entrance of your Book; for whosoever looks but further into it, and compares it with that you pretend to answer, will not condemn the choice of your Similitudes, but your forgetfulness in misapplying them. But it matters not what Titles you give to the Books of our Authors, unless you were better able to confute them: And if no other Book of any late Protestant Writer hath been any more discovered to be of *this intangling nature*, than this of his Lordship (whom you call *our grand Author*) is by you, you may very justly say of them as you do in the next words, *they are very liable to the same Reproach*: In which we commend your Ingenuity, that when you had so lately disparaged our Authors and Writings, you so suddenly wipe off those *Aspersions* again by giving them the deserved name of *Reproaches*. When you say his Lordship's Book is *most artificially composed*, we have reason to believe so fair a Testimony from a professed Adversary; but when notwithstanding this you call it a *Labyrinth*, we can interpret it only as a fair Plea for your not being able to answer it. And who can blame you for calling that a *Labyrinth* in which you have so miserably lost your self? But, in pity to you, and justice to the Cause I have undertaken, I shall endeavour with all kindness and fairness to reduce you out of your strange entanglements into the plain and easie Paths of Truth; which I doubt not to effect by your own *Clew of Scripture and Tradition*, by which you may soon discover what a *Labyrinth* you were in your self, when you had thought to have made *directive Marks* (as you call them) for others to avoid it.

To omit therefore any further Preface, I shall wait upon you to Particulars; the first of which is, *the Occasion of the Conference*, which (you say) was for the satisfaction of an honourable Lady, who having heard it granted in a former Conference, that there must be a continual visible company ever since Christ teaching unchanged Doctrine, in all Points necessary to Salvation; and finding (it seems) in her own reason that such a Company or Church must not be fallible in its teaching, was in quest of a Continual, Visible, Infallible Church, as not thinking it fit for unlearned Persons to judge of particular Doctrinals, but to depend on the judgment of the true Church. The Question then was not concerning a Continual and Visible Church, which you acknowledge was granted, but concerning such a Church as must be infallible in all she teaches, (and, if she be infallible, according to your Do-

S. 2.

P. 1.

P. 2.

S. 3.
P. 2.

ctrine of Fundamentals, whatever she teaches is necessary to Salvation) which that *Lady* thought necessary to be first determined, because, saith Mr. Fisher, *It was not for her, or any other unlearned Persons, to take upon them to judge of Particulars, without depending upon the judgment of the true Church;* which seeming to allow of some use of our own judgment, supposing the Churches Authority, you pervert into these words, *Not thinking it fit to judge, &c. but to depend, &c.* But let them be as they will, unless you gave greater Reason for them, it is not material which way they pass. For his Lordship had returned a sufficient Answer to that Pretence (which you are content to take no notice of) in saying, *That it is very fit the People should look to the judgment of the Church before they be too busie with Particulars. But yet neither Scripture, nor any good Authority denies them some moderate use of their own Understanding and Judgment, especially in things familiar and evident, which even ordinary Capacities may as easily understand as read. And therefore some Particulars a Christian may judge without depending.* To which you, having nothing to say, run post to the Business of Infallibility: For when it was said, *The Lady desired to rely on an Infallible Church, therein;* his Lordship says, *neither the Jesuit nor the Lady herself spake very advisedly: For an Infallible Church denotes a particular Church, in that it is set in opposition to some other particular Church that is not Infallible.* Here now you begin your discoveries: For you tell us, *he makes this his first Crook in his projected Labyrinth; which is apparent to any Man that has Eyes, even without the help of a Perspective.* As seldom as Perspectives are used to discern the turns of Labyrinths, nothing is so apparent, as that your Eyes or your Judgment were not very good when you used this Expression. For I pray, what Crook or Turn is there in that, when a Lady demanded an Infallible Church to her Guide, to say, that by that Question she supposeth some particular Church as distinct from, and opposite to others, to be infallible? No, say you, *she sought not any one particular Church infallible; in opposition to another Church not infallible; but some Church, such as might without danger of error direct her in all Doctrinal Points of Faith.* Rarely well distinguish'd! Not any particular Church, but some particular Church. For if she enquired after some Church, which, without danger of Error, might direct her in all Doctrinal Points of Faith, doth she not thereby imply, that some other Church might bring her into danger of Error, under pretence of directing her in Matters of Faith? And if this be some particular fallible Church, the other must be some particular infallible Church? And is it possible to conceive some Church that may err in directing, and some other that may not err, without some particular Church being taken in opposition to some other Church? But you would fain persuade us that the force of his Lordship's Argument rests wholly upon the importance of the Particle *a* or *an*, which cannot be applyed but to Particulars, which you very learnedly disprove: Whereas the main strength of what his Lordship says, depends upon the nature of the Question, and the manner of proposing it. For the Lady enquiring after such a Church whose judgment she might rely on as to the Matters in dispute in the Christian World, must mean such a Church whose Communion must be known as distinct from other Churches which are not infallible; for otherwise she might be deceived still. And if you give a pertinent Answer to her Question, you must shew her some such Church as an Infallible Guide, which can be no other in this case, but some particular Church considered as distinct from others. For a general Answer concerning the Infallibility of the *Catholick Church*, without shewing how the Infallible Judgment of that Church may be known, can by no means

means reach the Case in hand : Which doth not meerly respect an Infallibility in the Subject, but such an Infallibility as may be a *sufficient Guide in all Doctrinal Points of Faith*. When you say therefore, *she meant no other than the Universal visible Church of Christ*, you must tell us how the *Universal visible Church* can become such an *Infallible Guide* in the Matters in Controversie between those *Churches*, which yet are *Members* of that *Universal visible Church*. For the notion of the *Universal Church* not being in its nature confined to any one of these Parties, but all of them concurring to the making of it up, can no more be an *Infallible Guide* in the *Matters in difference*, than the common notion of *Animal* can direct us in judging what Beings are *Sensitive* and what *Rational*. Therefore though you would fain deceive the World under a pretence of the *Catholick Church*, yet nothing can be more evident, than that in the question what *Church*, must be a *guide in Doctrinal Points of Faith*, it must be understood of some *Church* as distinct from other *Churches*, which ought not to be relied on as infallible Guides. But the subtilty of this is, that when you challenge *Infallibility* to your *Church*, we should not apprehend her as a *particular Church*, but as the *true Catholick Church*, which is a thing so every way absurd and unreasonable, that you had need use the greatest Artifices to disguise it, which yet can deceive none but such as are resolved to be deceived by them. For any one who *had his Eyes in his Head might discern without a Perspective*, as you speak, that *Churches* of several and distinct Communion from each other were placed in competition for *Infallibility* : For Mr. Fisher's next words are, The Question was, *Which was that Church?* Do you think he means, Which was that *Universal visible Church*? Certainly not: for the nature of the Question supposes several *Churches* : Now I think you do not believe, there are several *Universal visible Churches*. And it immediately follows, *A Friend of the Ladies would needs defend that not only the Roman, but the Greek Church was right*; to which Mr. Fisher answers, *That the Greek Church had erred in Matter of Doctrine*. Can any thing be more plain, than that this *Question* doth relate to *Churches* considered severally, and as under distinct Communion and Denominations? And therefore notwithstanding your pitiful Pretences to the contrary, this *Question* can be no otherwise understood than, as his Lordship said, *of some particular Infallible Church, in opposition to some other particular Church which is not Infallible*. And if you judge this an *affected Mistake*, as you call it, your *discerning Faculty* will be as liable to *Question* as your *Churches Infallibility*.

That you might seem to avoid the better the force of his Lordship's following Discourse against *Bellarmino* about the Infallibility of the particular *Church of Rome*; you first tell us, *That it is sufficient for a Catholick to believe that there is an Infallibility in the Church, without further obligation to examine whether the particular Church of Rome be infallible or no*. Which is an egregious piece of Sophistry. For, put case a Man believes the *Catholick Church* of all *Ages* Infallible, but not of any one particular *Age* since the *Apostles* times; suppose a Man believe the *Catholick Church* of the present *Age* Infallible, but not of any one particular *Communion*, but as it takes in those common Truths wherein they are all agreed; will you say this is sufficient for a *Catholick* to believe without obligation to examine further? If you will speak it out, and, I dare say, you shall not have much thanks at *Rome* when you have done it. But the Mystery is, If a Man believes the *Roman Church* only, to be the *Catholick Church*, it is no matter whether he enquires whether the *Catholick Church* be only at *Rome* or no. It is not the place, but the *Communion* of the *Roman Church* which is now enquired after in

the question of *Infallibility*; although I cannot see but those places out of the *Fathers* which are produced to prove the *Roman Church* Infallible, will hold for the continuance of that Infallibility in that particular place of

Navigare audent ad Petri Cathedram, & Ecclesiam Principalem, &c. nec cogitare, eos esse Romanos ad quos perfidia habere non potest accessum. Cypr. l. 1. c. 3. Scito, Romanam fidem ejusmodi prestigias non recipere. Hierony. Apol. 3. c. Ruff. Roma semper fidem retinet. Greg. Nazianz. carm. de vita sua.

Rome. For St. Cyprian saith expressly of the *Romans*, that they are such to whom *Perfidia* (what ever be meant by it) cannot have access. St. Jerome saith, *The Roman Faith admits no Deceits into it.* Gregory Nazianzene, that *Rome retains the ancient Faith.* Not that I think any of these places do in the least import the Infallibility of the *Roman Church* (as will be shewed in its

proper place) but that, on supposition that *Infallibility* were implied in them, they would hold for the *Infallibility* of the particular *Roman Church*. And therefore *Bellarmin* understood what he did when he produced these places to that purpose, especially the *Apostolical See* remaining at *Rome*, as he supposeth himself in this part of the *Question* which he there discusseth. Either therefore you must assert that which his Lordship learnedly proves, viz. That no such thing as *Infallibility* is intended by any of these Citations, or else that it must extend to the particular *Roman Church*. And when you deny this to be an *Article of Faith* among *Catholicks*, that the particular *Roman Church* (the *Apostolical See* remaining there) is *Infallible*, prove at your leisure from any of these Citations that the *Church* within the *Roman Communion* is Infallible and not the particular *Roman Church*. And from what hath been hitherto said, I am so far from suspecting his Lordship's Candour, as you do, that I much rather suspect your judgment, and that you are not much used to attend to the Consequences of things, or else you would not have deserted *Bellarmin* in defence of so necessary and pertinent a Point as the *Infallibility* of the particular *Church* of *Rome*.

Bellarmin. de Pontifice Rom. l. 4. c. 4. sect. 1.

Page 4.

Secondly, You answer to his Lordship's Discourse concerning *Bellarmin's Authorities*, That you cannot hold your self obliged to take notice of his pretended Solutions, till you find them brought to evacuate the *Infallibility* of the *Catholick* or the *Roman Church* in its full latitude, as *Catholicks* ever mean it, save when they say the particular *Church* of *Rome*. But taking it in as full a Latitude as you please, I doubt not but to make it appear that the *Roman Church* is the *Roman Church* still, that is, a particular *Church* as distinct from the *Communion* of others, and therefore neither *Catholick* nor *Infallible*: Which I must refer to the place where you insist upon it, which I shall do without the imitation of your Vanity, in telling your Reader as far as *eightly and lastly* what fine *Exploits* you intend to do there. But usually those who brag most of their Valour before-hand, shew least in the Combat, and thus it will be found with you. I shall let you therefore enjoy your self in the pleasant thoughts of your noble intendments, till we come to the tryal of them; and so come to the present Controversie concerning the *Greek Church*.

The Defence of the Greek Church.

- § 5. It is none of the least of those Arts which you make use of for the perplexing the *Christian Faith*, to put Men upon inquiring after an *Infallible Church*, when yet you have no way to discern which is so much as a *true Church*, but by examining the *Doctrine* of it. So that of necessity the Rule of Faith and *Doctrine* must be certainly known, before ever any one can with safety depend upon the judgment of any *Church*. For having already proved that there can be no other meaning of the *Question* concerning the *Church*, as here stated, but with relation to *some particular Church* to whose *Communion*

nion the party enquiring might joyn, and whose judgment might be relied on; we see it presently follows in the debate, *Which was that Church*; and it seems, as is said already, a *Friend of the Ladies* undertook to defend that the *Greek Church* was right. To which Mr. *Fisher* answers, That the *Greek Church* had plainly changed, and taught false in a Point of Doctrine concerning the *Holy Ghost*: and after repeats it, that it had erred. Before I come to examine how you make good the charge you draw up against the poor *Greek Church* in making it err fundamentally, it is worth our while to consider upon what account this Dispute comes in. The Inquiry was concerning the *True Church*, on whose judgment one might safely depend in Religion. It seems, two were propounded to consideration, the *Greek* and the *Roman*; the *Greek* was rejected because it had erred: From whence it follows, that the Dispute concerning the Truth of Doctrine must necessarily precede that of the Church: For by Mr. *Fisher's* confession and your own, A Church which hath erred cannot be relied on; therefore Men must be satisfied whether a Church hath erred or no, before they can judge whether she may be relied on or no. Which being granted, all the whole *Fabrick* of your Book falls to the ground; for then, 1. Men must be *Infallibly certain* of the *Grounds of Faith* antecedently to the *Testimony of the Church*: For if they be to judge of a Church by the Doctrine, they must in order to such a judgment be certain what that Doctrine is which they must judge of the Church by. 2. No Church can be known to be *Infallible*, unless it appear to be so by that Doctrine which they are to examine the Truth of the Church by, and therefore no Church can be known to be *Infallible* by the *Motives of Credibility*. 3. No Church ought to be relied on as *Infallible*, which may be found guilty of any Error by comparing it with the Doctrine which we are to try it by. Therefore you must first prove your Church not to have erred in any particular; for if she hath, it is impossible she should be *Infallible*: And not think to prove that she hath not erred because she cannot, that being the thing in question, and must by your dealing with the *Greek Church* be judged by Particulars. 4. There must be a certain Rule of Faith supposed to have sufficient Authority to decide Controversies without any dependence upon the Church. For, the Matter to be judged is the Church; and if the Scripture may and must decide that, Why may it not as well all the rest? 5. Every Man's Reason proceeding according to this Rule of Faith must be left his Judge in Matters of Religion. And whatever Inconveniencies you can imagine to attend upon this, they immediately and necessarily follow from your proceeding with the *Greek Church* by excluding her because she hath erred, which while we are in pursuit of a Church can be determined by nothing but every ones particular Reason. 6. Then Fundamentals do not depend upon the Churches Declaration. For you assert the *Greek Church* to err fundamentally, and that this may be made appear to one who is seeking after a Church. Suppose then I inquire, as the Lady did, after a Church whose judgment I must absolutely depend on, and some mention the *Greek*, and others the *Roman Church*: You tell me, It cannot be the *Greek*, for that hath erred fundamentally. I inquire how you know, supposing her to err, that it is a fundamental Error? Will you answer me, because the true Church hath declared it to be a fundamental Error? But that was it I was seeking for which that Church is, which may declare what Errors are fundamental and what not? If you tell me It is yours, I may soon tell you, You seem to have a greater kindness for your Church than your self, and venture to speak any thing for the sake of it. Thus we see how

the question of *Infallibility*; although I cannot see but those places out of the *Fathers* which are produced to prove the *Roman Church* Infallible, will hold for the continuance of that Infallibility in that particular place of

Navigare audent ad Petri Cathedram, & Ecclesiam Principalem, &c. nec cogitare, eos esse Romanos ad quos perfidia habere non potest accessum. Cypr. l. 1. c. 3. Scito, Romanam fidem ejusmodi prestigias non recipere. Hierony. Apol. 3. c. Ruff. Roma semper fidem retinet. Greg. Nazianz. carm. de vita sua.

Rome. For St. Cyprian saith expressly of the *Romans*, that they are such to whom *Perfidia* (what ever be meant by it) cannot have access. St. Jerome saith, *The Roman Faith admits no Deceits into it.* Gregory Nazianzene, that *Rome retains the ancient Faith.* Not that I think any of these places do in the least import the Infallibility of the *Roman Church* (as will be shewed in its

proper place) but that, on supposition that *Infallibility* were implied in them, they would hold for the *Infallibility* of the particular *Roman Church*. And therefore *Bellarmin* understood what he did when he produced these places to that purpose, especially the *Apostolical See* remaining at *Rome*, as he supposeth himself in this part of the *Question* which he there discusseth. Either therefore you must assert that which his Lordship learnedly proves, viz. That no such thing as *Infallibility* is intended by any of these Citations, or else that it must extend to the particular *Roman Church*. And when you deny this to be an *Article of Faith* among *Catholicks*, that the particular *Roman Church* (the *Apostolical See* remaining there) is *Infallible*, prove at your leisure from any of these Citations that the *Church* within the *Roman Communion* is Infallible and not the particular *Roman Church*. And from what hath been hitherto said, I am so far from suspecting his Lordship's Candour, as you do, that I much rather suspect your judgment, and that you are not much used to attend to the Consequences of things, or else you would not have deserted *Bellarmin* in defence of so necessary and pertinent a Point as the *Infallibility* of the particular *Church* of *Rome*.

Bellarmin. de Pontifice Rom. l. 4. c. 4. Sect. 1.

Page 4.

Secondly, You answer to his Lordship's Discourse concerning *Bellarmin's* Authorities, That you cannot hold your self obliged to take notice of his pretended Solutions, till you find them brought to evacuate the *Infallibility* of the *Catholick* or the *Roman Church* in its full latitude, as *Catholicks* ever mean it, save when they say the particular *Church* of *Rome*. But taking it in as full a Latitude as you please, I doubt not but to make it appear that the *Roman Church* is the *Roman Church* still, that is, a particular *Church* as distinct from the *Communion* of others, and therefore neither *Catholick* nor *Infallible*: Which I must refer to the place where you insist upon it, which I shall do without the imitation of your Vanity, in telling your Reader as far as *eighthly* and *lastly* what fine Exploits you intend to do there. But usually those who brag most of their Valour before-hand, shew least in the Combat, and thus it will be found with you. I shall let you therefore enjoy your self in the pleasant thoughts of your noble intendments, till we come to the tryal of them; and so come to the present Controversie concerning the *Greek Church*.

The Defence of the Greek Church.

- § 5. It is none of the least of those Arts which you make use of for the perplexing the *Christian Faith*, to put Men upon inquiring after an *Infallible Church*, when yet you have no way to discern which is so much as a *true Church*, but by examining the *Doctrine* of it. So that of necessity the Rule of Faith and Doctrine must be certainly known, before ever any one can with safety depend upon the judgment of any *Church*. For having already proved that there can be no other meaning of the *Question* concerning the *Church*, as here stated, but with relation to some particular *Church* to whose Communion

nion the party enquiring might joyn, and whose judgment might be relied on; we see it presently follows in the debate, *Which was that Church*; and it seems, as is said already, a *Friend of the Ladies* undertook to defend that the Greek Church was right. To which Mr. Fisher answers, That the Greek Church had plainly changed, and taught false in a Point of Doctrine concerning the Holy Ghost: and after repeats it, that it had erred. Before I come to examine how you make good the charge you draw up against the poor Greek Church in making it err fundamentally, it is worth our while to consider upon what account this Dispute comes in. The Inquiry was concerning the *True Church*, on whose judgment one might safely depend in Religion. It seems, two were propounded to consideration, the Greek and the Roman; the Greek was rejected because it had erred: From whence it follows, that the Dispute concerning the Truth of Doctrine must necessarily precede that of the Church: For by Mr. Fisher's confession and your own, A Church which hath erred cannot be relied on; therefore Men must be satisfied whether a Church hath erred or no, before they can judge whether she may be relied on or no. Which being granted, all the whole *Fabrick* of your Book falls to the ground; for then, 1. Men must be *Infallibly certain* of the *Grounds of Faith* antecedently to the *Testimony of the Church*: For if they be to judge of a Church by the Doctrine, they must in order to such a judgment be certain what that Doctrine is which they must judge of the Church by. 2. No Church can be known to be Infallible, unless it appear to be so by that Doctrine which they are to examine the Truth of the Church by, and therefore no Church can be known to be Infallible by the *Motives of Credibility*. 3. No Church ought to be relied on as Infallible, which may be found guilty of any Error by comparing it with the Doctrine which we are to try it by. Therefore you must first prove your Church not to have erred in any particular; for if she hath, it is impossible she should be Infallible: And not think to prove that she hath not erred because she cannot, that being the thing in question, and must by your dealing with the Greek Church be judged by Particulars. 4. There must be a certain Rule of Faith supposed to have sufficient Authority to decide Controversies without any dependence upon the Church. For, the Matter to be judged is the Church; and if the Scripture may and must decide that, Why may it not as well all the rest? 5. Every Man's Reason proceeding according to this Rule of Faith must be left his Judge in Matters of Religion. And whatever Inconveniencies you can imagine to attend upon this, they immediately and necessarily follow from your proceeding with the Greek Church by excluding her because she hath erred, which while we are in pursuit of a Church can be determined by nothing but every ones particular Reason. 6. Then Fundamentals do not depend upon the Churches Declaration. For you assert the Greek Church to err fundamentally, and that this may be made appear to one who is seeking after a Church. Suppose then I inquire, as the Lady did, after a Church whose judgment I must absolutely depend on, and some mention the Greek, and others the Roman Church: You tell me, It cannot be the Greek, for that hath erred fundamentally. I inquire how you know, supposing her to err, that it is a fundamental Error? Will you answer me, because the true Church hath declared it to be a fundamental Error? But that was it I was seeking for which that Church is, which may declare what Errors are fundamental and what not? If you tell me *It is yours*, I may soon tell you, You seem to have a greater kindness for your Church than your self, and venture to speak any thing for the sake of it. Thus we see how

see how finely you have betrayed your whole Cause in your first Onset, by so rude an Attempt upon the *Greek Church*.

And truly it was much your Concernment, to load her as much as you can : For though she now wants one of the great Marks of your *Church* (which yet you know not how long your *Church* may enjoy) viz. outward Splendour and Bravery, yet you cannot deny, but that *Church* was planted by the *Apostles*, enjoyed a continual Succession from them, flourished with a number of the *Fathers* exceeding that of yours, had more of the *Councils* of greatest Credit in it, and, which is a Commendation still to it, it retains more Purity under its Persecutions, than your *Church* with all its external Splendour. But she hath erred concerning the *Holy Ghost*, and therefore hath lost it. A severe Censure which his Lordship rebukes Mr. Fisher for citing King James so boldly for : But two ways it may be taken, he adds. 1. To lose such Assistance as preserves from all Error. 2. Or else from all fundamental Error, this therefore, his Lordship truly saith, is an Error of the first sort, and not of the latter.

Passing by therefore his Lordships Expressions of his Modesty, which if an Error is one you are like to be secured from ; and his cautious Expressions concerning the *Greek Church* which he highly shewed his Wisdom in, was to me to consider how you prove the *Greek Church* guilty of fundamental Error. You say, You pass by his trifling, and make way for Truth. I wonder not to see you reflect on his Lordship for his Modesty, considering how little of it you shew towards him ; let us then make way too, but it is to see you and Truth Combat together. It is to be considered, say you, that now for many hundred years, the whole Latine Church hath decreed and believed it to be flat Heresie in the Greeks ; and they decreed the contrary to be an Heresie in the Latin Church, and both together condemned the Opinion of the Grecians as Heretical in a General Council (in Florentino) how then bears it any shew of probability, what some few of yesterday (forced to it by an impossibility of otherwise avoiding the strength of Catholick Arguments against them) affirm, that the matter of this Controversie was so small and inconsiderable, that it is not sufficient to produce an Heresie on either side ? Is not this to make all the Churches of Christendome for many hundred years quite blind, and themselves only clear and sharp sighted ? Which swelling Presumption what Spirit it argues, and whence it proceeds, all those who have learn'd from St. Augustin, that Pride is the Mother of Heresie, will easily collect. I grant this Speech of St. Augustin to be true ; only let it be added, that Pride is likewise the Mother of making Heresies, as will appear in this present Controversie ; and whether we, who vindicate the *Greek Church* from Heresie, or you who would find the Bill against her (to keep her from any Rivalship with your Church) be more guilty of Pride will be soon discovered ; but sure you believe us not only to be Men of yesterday, but to know nothing who should sentence the *Greek Church* for Heresie upon such feeble Pretences as these are. I know not what Presumption that can be, to say, Men may be too forward on both sides in calling each other Hereticks, and it may be not so much their Blindness, as Pride and Passion which may make them do it. But if they will condemn that for Heresie, which is not so made appear to be upon any evidence from Scripture and Reason, they were not so blind in defining it, as we should be in following their judgment without further examination. But this was for many hundred years. The more to blame they, for continuing in so rash judgments so long, if it appear so. But it is well still you tell us, that as the Latin Church condemned the Greek for Heresie, the Greek condemned the Latin for it too. And so by your own rule the one was

was as blind as the other. *But the Latin Church had the right to determine Heresie, and the Greek had not.* This is the Question, Which Church must be relyed on for Judgment? And if they mutually condemn each other, we must have a higher Rule to judge of both by. *But still, It is not an Argument, that it is a Heresie of one side or the other, because each Party condemns the other of Heresie?* Just as much, as if two Men fall out, and call each other *Knaves*, it must be granted, that if both be not, yet at least the one of them is so. *Heresie* being grown the *scolding word in Religion*; and no two Parties can differ, but they seek to fasten this Reproach on each other. If one should bring greater Evidence than the other of his *Knavery*, he ought to be more accounted so. No otherwise can it be here; if sufficient Proof be brought of *Heresie* on the one side, and not the other, that Party may be looked on as more guilty: But still remembring, that the more confident Affirmation, the Pretence to greater Honesty and Power, be not taken for the only Evidences of it: As I doubt it will appear in our present Case. But still suppose, that of two Men who have so Reproached each other, the one of them being fallen into Distress and Poverty, and not hoping for Relief but from the other Person, and he denying it, unless he be content by joynt consent to be proclaimed *Knave*, which he through his necessity yielding to, but as soon as that is over declaring on what account they agreed; Must this Man be more pitied for his Necessity, or condemned for his *Knavery*? Just such I shall make it appear, that which you call condemning the *Grecians* as *Heretical* in a General Council at Florence, to have been, and no otherwise.

But I come to a closer Examination of this Subject, to see with what Justice you charge the *Greek Church*, either with *Heresie* or *Schism*; For both these you accuse it of in this Chapter. Two things were the most in dispute between the *Greek* and *Latin Churches*, the one was the *Doctrine* of the *Procession of the Holy Ghost from Father and Son*, the other was concerning the *Addition* of the *Filioque* to the *Creed*. And although the *Greeks* in their Debates at *Ferrara* would not meddle with the *Doctrine*, before the *Latins* could clear themselves concerning the *Addition*, which they said was the main cause of the *Contest* between them; yet I am content to follow your Method, and handle the other first. Your Discourse concerning the first, consists of two parts, *Proofs* and *Answers*; *Proofs* of their *Heresie*, and *Answers* to his Lordship's *Arguments* against it. The *Proofs* are double, the one from *Authority*, the other from *Theological Reason*. Through every of these Particulars I shall follow you, and from them I doubt not to evince, that the *Greeks* are not guilty of the Faults you lay to their Charge.

We have already seen what your *Proofs* from *Authority* are; their condemning one another for *Hereticks*, and the *Greeks* being condemned by a *General Council*. If I can therefore prove that the *Greeks* Opinion was not accounted an *Heresie* before the *Council of Florence*, and that it did not become a *Heresie* by the *Council of Florence*, I shall sufficiently discover the Weakness of your *Arguments* from *Authority*.

I. That it was not accounted a *Heresie* before the *Council of Florence*; I mean not, that there were no hot-brain'd Persons in all the time of the Difference, who did not brand the *Greek Church* with *Heresie*, but that it was never accounted a *Heresie*, by any of those whom your selves account the only competent Judges of *Heresie*; and those are either the *Fathers*, or *Popes*, or *Councils*: Which I prove in their order.

C

1. That

1. That it was not accounted Heresie by the *Fathers*; which will be proved by these two things. 1. Because it is very doubtful whether many of the *Fathers* did believe the Procession of the *Holy Ghost* from the *Son* or no. 2. Because those who did believe it, did not condemn those of Heresie who did not.

1. That it is very doubtful whether many of them did believe the *Procession of the Holy Ghost from the Son or no*; at least, so far as to make it an *Article of Faith*; for 1. There are clear Testimonies that they make it unnecessary to be believed. 2. The Testimonies which seem to say, That they did believe it, do not necessarily imply that they did.

1. That there are clear Testimonies, that they did not account it a thing necessary to be believed: Both because they in Terms asserted the Nature of this *Procession* to be *incomprehensible*, and withal, did as clearly affirm the belief of that, which doth not imply this *Procession* to be sufficient for Salvation. 1. They in Terms assert, that the *Mystery of this Procession is incomprehensible*. And can you, or any reasonable Man, imagine they should make the manner of that *Procession* to be an *Article of Faith*, which they acknowledge to be absolutely beyond our apprehension? I grant, Something supposed by them to be *incomprehensible* is made an *Article of Faith*: But then it is not that which is supposed as *incomprehensible* under that Notion, which is made so; but the thing it self which may be *incomprehensible*; yet being clearly revealed in *Scripture*, ought to be believed, notwithstanding that *Incomprehensibility* of it: As the *Mystery of the Trinity* it self, the *Eternal Generation of the Son*, the *Procession of the Spirit from the Father*, &c. But then I say, these things are such, as are either declared by them to be expressly revealed in *Scripture*, or necessarily consequent from something supposed to be so. As for instance, supposing the *Trinity in Unity* to be something Divinely revealed, whatever is necessarily consequent from that, and is necessary to be believed in order to that, though it be *incomprehensible*, must be believed; as, Supposing these two things clear from *Scripture*, that there is but one true *God*, and that there are *three Persons*, who have the Name, Properties, and Attributes of *God* given to them, though our Reason be too short to fathom the manner how these can have three distinct *Subsistences*, and yet but one *Essence*, because our Reason (*i. e.* all those Conceptions which we have formed in our Mind from the observation of things) doth tell us, that *Those things which agree or disagree in a third, agree, or disagree one with another*, and from thence it would infer, that, if the *Father* be *God*, and the *Son* *God*, there could be no difference between *Father* and *Son*; yet this being meerly as to the Connexion of two Propositions, both of which are supposed distinctly revealed in *Scripture*; we are bound in this case to believe such a *Connexion*, because both parts are equally revealed by an *Infallible Testimony*, though the *Mode* of that *Connexion* be to us *Incomprehensible*: But it is not so, where neither clear Revelation, nor a necessary Consequent from something which is divinely revealed doth inforce our Belief of it. As in our present Case: Since we suppose it revealed in *Scripture*, that *Father, Son, and Holy Ghost are God*, whatever is necessary to the belief of that, though *incomprehensible*, we ought to believe it: But if there be something without which I may believe the *Deity* of the *Father, Son and Spirit*, and this not clearly asserted in *Scripture*, but is a thing in it self *incomprehensible*, that cannot be made a necessary *Article of Faith*: Thus that the *Spirit* doth proceed from the *Father*, seems necessary on both accounts, as consequent upon the Belief of the *Trinity in Unity*, and as clearly expressed in *Scripture*:

pture : But that the Spirit should proceed from *Father and Son* as from one Principle, that they should Communicate in an Action proper to their Substances, and yet be distinguished from each other in those Substances, and agree only in Essence, (and if the Spirit proceeds not from their Substances, but from the Essence, the Spirit must proceed from it self, because that is common to all three;) these things being in themselves incomprehensible, and not necessary to the Belief of the Divinity, either of Son or Holy Ghost, nor pretended to be clearly revealed in Scripture, cannot be said to make a necessary Article of Faith, the denial of which must suppose *Heretic*. And therefore that which is the only Objection in this case is removed, viz. that this Procession of the Spirit from the Father is incomprehensible, and yet supposed to be an Article of Faith; for that I have already shewed is expressly revealed in Scripture, that *John 14. the Spirit doth proceed from the Father*. But neither is the Procession from the Son necessary to the Belief of the Deity of the Son; for if it were, it would be as necessary to the Deity of the Holy Ghost that the Son should be begotten by the Spirit; neither doth it follow from any place of Scripture, for all those places which are usually brought are very capable of such Interpretations, as do not at all infer it; from hence then it follows, that those who upon these Terms acknowledge this Procession incomprehensible, do therein imply, that the belief of it is no Article necessary to Salvation, and therefore the denial no *Heretic*.

Now for this we have the clearest Testimonies of such who were the greatest and most zealous assertors of the Doctrine of the Trinity. *Athanasius* saith expressly, *That it is sufficient to know, that*

the Spirit is no Creature, nor to be reckoned among God's Works; for nothing of another nature is mingled with the Trinity, but it is undivided, and like it self: These things are sufficient for Believers. But, saith he, when we come hither, the Cherubims veil their Faces; but he that inquires and searches into more than these, neglects him that hath said, Be not wise over-much, &c. If it be sufficient to know, that the Spirit is no Creature, it cannot be necessary to believe, that the Spirit proceeds from the Son: For they who do not

believe that, do firmly believe the Deity of it. And if whatever goes beyond that, goes beyond the bounds which God hath set us, then certainly he never dreamt that Men should be condemned for Heretic, as to some things which cannot be supposed to be within them. To the same purpose speaks

St. Basil in several places, acknowledging the Procession of the Holy Ghost to be a thing inexplicable, and when the Hereticks enquired of him, What kind of thing that Procession was, when the Spirit was neither ἀγνός, nor yet γινώσκος, all the answer he gives them, is, If there be such multitudes of things in the World which we are ignorant of, what shame is it to confess our Ignorance here? And if it be here our Duty

to confess our Ignorance, it is far from it to be Magisterial and Definitive, that unless Men acknowledge every Puntilio, they are guilty of Heretic and fundamental Errors. St. Gregory Nazianzen men-

Ἀρχαὶ γινώσκουσιν ὅτι μὴ κτίσμα ἐστὶ τὸ πνεῦμα, μὴδὲ τοῖς ποιήμασι συναεισμεύεται, ἐπεὶ ἄλλόττειον ἐμπιγνύσκει τῇ Τριάδι, ἀλλ' ἀδιαιρέτως ἐστὶ, καὶ ὁμοία ἑαυτῇ. Ἀρχαὶ ταῦτα τοῖς πιστοῖς. ὡς τῶν τὰ Χερουβὶμ καλύπτει τὰς ὀφθαλμοὺς. Ὁ δὲ περιττὰ τῶν ζητῶν καὶ δίλων ἐρευνᾷ παρακίε τὸ λέγοντος, μὴ σοφίζεσθαι πολλά, &c. *Athanas. ep. ad Serapion. p. 357. Tom. I.*

Εἰ δὲ πολλὰ ἀγνοοῖς, καὶ μετριοπλάστια τῶν ἐγνωσμένων ἐστὶ τὰ ἀγνοούμενα, πῶς μὴ πάντων καὶ περὶ τῶν τρόπων τῆς ὑπάξεως τὸ ἀγνόν πνεῦματος τὴν ἀκίνδυνον ἀγνοίαν ἀνεπαρκῶς ὁμολογᾷς; *Basil. De Spir. Sanct. c. 18.*

Τίς ἂν ἡ ἐκπύρευσις ; εἰπέ σὺ τὸν ἀγ-
γιστὴν τῶ πατρὸς, καὶ γὰρ τὴν γλῶσσιν τῶ
υἱῷ φυσιολογήσω, καὶ τὴν ἐκπύρευσιν τῶ
πνεύματι, καὶ παραπληκτίσωμαι ἀμφω
εἰς Θεοῦ μυστήρια παρεκύπτοντες. καὶ
ταῦτα ἴνες, οἱ μὴδὲ τὰ ἐν ποσὶν εἰδέ-
ναι δυνάμενοι, &c. Greg. Nazian.
orat. 37. p. 597. Tom. 1.

Εἰ δὲ τὸν τρόπον ἐκζητῆς ἢ καλεῖ-
σθαι τοῖς μόνοις γινώσκων ἄλληλα καὶ
γινώσκειν ὑπὸ ἄλλήλων μαρτυρομένοις.
Orat. 23. Tom. 1. p. 426.

Ὅτι μὲν οὕτως καὶ ὑπάρχει καὶ τῶν ὅλων
κράτει συναίνων τε καὶ συνεκτιμώμε-
να δὲ ὥσπερ τῶν τῆς ἀνθρώπου
τῆς μετῶν ἵνα τὸν ἵον σωφρόν-
ηται ἐφείας. Cyril. Paschal. 12.
Tom. 5. p. 2.

tioning that Question, *What this Proceſſion is ?* re-
turns this Answer, *Tell me first what it is for the Fa-
ther to be unbegotten, and I will explain the Genera-
tion of the Son, and Proceſſion of the Holy Ghost ;*
that we may both therein shew our Folly, who pry into
these Divine Mysteries, and do not know the things
which are before our Feet. And elsewhere, *If we*
enquire into these things, what shall we leave to them,
whom the Scripture tells us alone know and are known
of each other ? St. Cyril requires of Men, *To be-
lieve his Being, and Subsistence, and Dominion over*
all ; but for other things not to suffer the Mind to go
beyond the Bounds allotted to humane Nature. These
spoke like wise Men, and the true Fathers of the
Church, who would have Men content themselves
with believing meerly what was necessary in these
deep and incomprehensible Mysteries, and not to
make *Articles of Faith* of such things which are not

made necessary, either by deduction of Reason, or clear Divine Revela-
tion. Although therefore I should grant, that some, or all of these, did
themselves believe this *Proceſſion* from the Son, yet hereby it appears
they were far from imposing it upon others, or making it a *Hereſie* in any
not to believe it. They saw well these were not things to be narrowly
searched into, but as the *Philosopher* said of some kind of *Hellebore*, ta-
ken in the lump it is Medicinal, but beaten into Powder is dangerous, is
true of these more abstruse Mysteries of Religion ; for whosoever
will endeavour to satisfy himself concerning them from the strange Ni-
ceties and Subtilties of the Schools, may return with greater Doubts
than he went to them. For not to go beyond our present Subject,
whosoever would examine the way they take to make the *Proceſſion*
to be immediate from the Father and the Son, so as to be from
one Principle, to shew how the Spirit comes from both by the same
numerical Spiration ; but most all, when they come to make Di-
stinctions between the Generation of the Son, and the Proceſſion of
the Holy Ghost, (of which no less than nine are recounted and reje-
cted by *Petavius*, out of the Fathers and Schoolmen, and the last
which he rests in, which is the common one of the Schools, viz.
That the one is *per modum Intellectus*, and the other *per modum Amo-
ris*, as unsatisfactory as any, there being so vast a disproportion between
the most immediate Acts of our Souls and these Emanations) will see
much greater Reason to commend the Wisdom of those Fathers, who
sought to repress Mens Curiosity as to these things, and as much to con-
demn you, who are so apt to charge whole Churches with Hereſie, if
they come not up to every thing which you shall pronounce to be an
Article of Faith.

Dogm. The-
ol. de Tri-
nit. l. 7. c.
13, 14.
Tom. 2.

§. 8.

2. It is plain from the Fathers, *That they made the belief of that to be suf-
ficient for Salvation, which doth not imply this Proceſſion from the Son ;* which
is, that the Holy Ghost doth proceed from the Father : If therefore they
often mention the *Proceſſion from the Father*, without taking notice of
the *Proceſſion from the Son*, and when they do so, assert the sufficiency
of the Belief of that for Salvation ; there cannot be the least ground to
imagine that they looked on the Proceſſion from the Son as a necessary
Article of Faith. We see before, *Athanasius* made no more necessary,
than

than the Belief of the Divinity of the Holy Ghost; and in the same Discourse, where he speaks expressly what the Orthodox Opinion was of the Holy Ghost, he says no more, but, *If they thought well of the Word, they would likewise of the Spirit, which proceeds from the Father, and is proper to the Son, and is given by him to the Disciples, and all that believe on him.* In which words there is nothing but what the Greeks to this day do most freely and heartily acknowledge, viz. *That the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father, and is the Spirit of the Son, being given by him to all that believe.* Many

other Testimonies are produced out of him and the rest of the Greek Fathers, by the Patriarch Hieremias in his Answer to the Wirtenberg Divines, by Marcus Ephesius in his Disputes in the Council of Florence, by Gregorius Palamas in his Answer to Beccus the Latinizing Pa-

triarch of Constantinople, in the time of Michael Paleologus, and other modern Defendants of the Greek Church. But although I do not think, that the places produced by them are sufficient for their purpose, viz. *That those Fathers believed the Procession from the Father, exclusive, to be an Article of Faith;* yet whosoever will take the pains to compare these Testimo-

nies with the others produced on the other side by those who writ in defence of the Filioque, either Latins, as Hugo Eterianus, Anselme, &c. or Latinizing Greeks, such as Nicephorus Blemmydes, Beccus, Emanuel Calecas, and others, will find it most for the honour of the Fathers, and most consonant to Truth, to assert that they did not look upon this as any necessary Article of Faith, and therefore took liberty to express themselves differently about it as they saw occasion. For such different Testimonies are produced, not only of different Fathers, but of several places of the same, that it will be a hard matter, but upon this Ground to reconcile them to each other and themselves: And that which abundantly confirms it, is, That when they sate most solemnly in Council to determine the Matters of Faith about the Trinity, they were so far from inserting this, when they had just occasion to do it, that they only mention the Proceeding from the Father, and determine this to be a perfect Symbol of Christian Faith which contained no more. In the first Nicene Creed, and that which is properly so called, (for that which now goes under that Name is the Constantinopolitan Creed) there was nothing at all determined concerning the Procession of the Holy Ghost; and yet Athanasius saith expressly of the Faith there delivered by the Fathers according to the Scriptures, *That it was of it self sufficient for the*

turning Men from all Impiety, and the Establishment of all Christian Piety. And afterwards saith, *That though certain Men contended much for some Additions to be made to it, yet the Sardican Synod would by no means consent to it, because the Nicene Creed was not defective, but sufficient for Piety, and therefore forbid the making of any new Creed, lest the former should be accounted defective.* We see then by the Testimony of

Athanasius and the Sardican Synod, (which when it serves your turn, as in the Case of Appeals, you extol so much, and in defence of Zosimus his Forgery of the Nicene Canons, you would have confounded with the

Εἰ γὰρ ἐφάρθεν ὁρθῶς πρὸς τὸ λόγον, ἐφάρθεν ἂν ὑγιῶν καὶ πρὸς τὸ ἀγίου πνεύματος· ὁ πατὴρ τὸ πνεῦμα ἐκπορεύεται, καὶ τὸ υἱὸν ἰδὼν ὅν, παρ' αὐτοῦ μετέδιδται τοῖς μαθηταῖς, καὶ πάντε τοῖς πιστεύουσιν εἰς αὐτόν. Athanas. c. Serap. ubi supr.

Athen Theolog. Wirtenberg. p. 217. &c.
Ref. 2. Patriarch.
Concil. Florent. sess. 19, 20, 21, &c.
Arcudii opuscula aurea.
V. ep. cyrilli Patriarch. ad Joh. Uttenbogard. inter epistol. Remonstrant. p. 402.

V. Leonis Allatii Graciam Orthodox. Tom. 2.

Ἡ γὰρ ἐν αὐτῇ ᾧ τῶν πατέρων κατὰ τὰς δεύρας γεγραπὴς ὁμολογηθεῖσα πίστις, ἀνέλεγκτος ἐστὶ πρὸς ἀναλεγκτὴν μὲν πίστιν ἀποδείξαι, συστασὶν δὲ εὐσεβείας, ἐν χεῖρεσσι. Athanas. ep. ad Epiſter. Tom. 1. p. 562.

Greg. Na-
zian. Ep. 2.
ad Cled.

the *Nicene*) that the *Nicene Creed* without any thing at all concerning the *Procession of the Holy Ghost* was looked on as sufficient to Salvation, and therefore certainly they did not then judge this Article of the *Procession* to be so necessary as you would have it be. But suppose we yield *Nazianzen*, and the *Fathers of the Constantinopolitan Council*, that though this *Creed* was not defective as to the *Son*, yet there ought to be somewhat added further concerning the *Holy Ghost*, upon the rising of *Macedonius*: Yet even here we shall find when they purposely added to the Article of the *Holy Ghost*, they added only this touching the *Procession* τοῦ ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκπορεύοντος, which proceedeth from the Father. And thus the Copies of the *Constantinopolitan Creed*, either in the *Councils*, or elsewhere have it, where they mention the *Procession* at all; And when *Marcus Ephesus* in the *Florentine Council* read this *Creed*, the *Latins* took no Exceptions at all to it, but it passed then as it doth still for the *Nicene Creed*, (although it much differs from the Original *Nicene*) and therefore it is a great Mistake of them, who imagine the Article of *Filioque* was found in some Copies of this *Creed*, for this the *Latins* never pretended in the *Florentine Council*, (but did indeed as to the *Creed* of the second Council of *Nice*, but were therein much suspected of Forgery by the *Greeks*) which might be the Ground of that Mistake. But that which I insist on, is, If this Article of the *Procession of the Holy Ghost* from the *Son* had been by these *Fathers* judged necessary, when had there been a fitter time to insert it than now, when purposely they added the *Procession* to the former *Creed*? And yet we see they did not judge it at all necessary to be inserted. It may be you will say, it was, *Because the Controversie was not then started concerning the Filioque*; But that can signifie nothing here, because we have already shewed that the *Fathers* themselves spake differently concerning it, and looked upon it as a thing not necessary to be known; but the things which were upon the rising of *Hereticks* inserted into the *Creed*, were such as by the *Fathers* were judged and believed as necessary before ever those *Hereticks* arose; as in the Case here of *Macedonius*, for I hope you will not say it was no Heresie to deny the *Divinity* of the *Holy Ghost*, till it was determined in this *Oecumenical Council*? For the *Fathers* never thought that they made Articles of Faith in *Councils*, but only declared themselves, and what they believed against the *Hereticks* which did arise in the *Church*: And therefore that Answer of the *Filioque* not being then controverted, comes to nothing. From hence we come to the third *Oecumenical Council*, to see if that adds any thing concerning this *Procession*; instead of which it highly confirms what was established before; for the *Fathers* of that *Council* discerning at last the great Inconveniency of making such Additions to the *Creed*, because the *Nestorians* had got the Art of it too, and made a new *Creed* of their own, (which by *Charisius* was brought to the Council and there read) upon which the *Ephesine Fathers* make an irrevocable Decree against all Additions being made hereafter to the *Creed*. For after they had caused the *Nicene*, or rather the *Constantinopolitan Creed* to be publicly read (in which yet the Article of *Procession* was left out, as appears by that Copy which *Marcus Ephesus* produced at the Council of *Ferrara*, as it is likewise in the Copies of the *Ephesine Council*) upon which they pass this definitive Sentence; That it should not be lawful hereafter for any one to produce, write, or compose any other *Creed*, besides

Concil. E-
phes. Part.
2. Act. 6.
p. 357.
Tom. 2. Bi-
nii ed. Par.
1636.
Concil. Flo-
rent. sess.
5. p. 587.
Μηδεν
ἐξείναι

μεστέρειν, ἢ ἄν συγγράφειν, ἢ συνιδέναι ἐτέραν πίσιν, ὅσα ἢ δευδέναν παρὰ τὸν ἀγίον πατέρα τὸν ἐν Νικαίᾳ συναχθέντων ἐν ἀγίῳ πνεύματι. Concil. Eph. Part. 2. Act. 6. p. 366.

that

that which was agreed on and designed by the Holy Fathers, who were met together at Nice by the Holy Spirit. Concerning the meaning of this Decree, we shall fully enquire when we come to the addition of the *Filioque*. That which I take notice of it now for, is, not only the further Ratification of what was in the *Creed* before, and that what was therein contained was as much as was judged necessary, but an express Decree made against all after-additions; which doth, as fully as a *General Council* could do, declare that nothing else was necessary to be believed, but what was already inserted in the *Creed*: Or else, To what end did they prohibit any further Additions? To the like purpose, the fourth *General Council* of *Chalcedon* determines, *That by no means they would suffer that Faith to be moved which*

was already defined. I might proceed to the fifth and sixth *Councils*, but these are sufficient. Let me now put some few *Questions* to you: Are *General Councils* Infallible, or no? *Yes*, say you, *if confirmed by the Pope.* Were not these four first

κατ' ἑξῆς τρόπον σαλεύεσθαι πρὸς πᾶν ἀνεχόμεθα ἢ ὁριθεῖσιν πίσιν.
Concil. Chalced. Act. 5. Concil. Florent. Aff. 5. p. 590.

Councils confirmed? *Yes*, it is evident they were. Were they then Infallible in all their Decrees or no, especially concerning Matters of Faith? If they were, were they not Infallible in this Determination, That it should not be lawful to add to the *Creed* any thing else but what was in before? Were they Infallible in declaring the received *Creed* to be full and sufficient? If they were so, how comes any Article to become necessary, which was not then in the *Creed*? If you say, The *Pope* and another *General Council* have Power Infallibly to contradict these, and to say that somewhat else is necessary to be inserted into the *Creed*, and to be believed in order to Salvation; I must content my self with having brought you to the humble Confession, that both parts of a Contradiction may be infallibly determined. Thus we see that the *Fathers*, whether single or joyned, in such *Councils* which are of the greatest Authority in the Christian World, have been so far from believing or determining this Article of the *Procession* of the Holy Ghost to be necessary, (which must be, if the denial of it be a fundamental Error) that they have plainly enough expressed and determined the contrary.

2. The next thing we come to, is, *That those Testimonies which are produced out of the Fathers, are so far from asserting the Necessity of this Article, that the most of them do not evidently prove that they believed it.* For these two Answers the *Greeks* return to them.

1. That they do not assert the *Procession* of the Spirit from the Son, but the *Consubstantiality* of the Spirit with the Son. 2. That those which speak of a *Procession*, do not mean it of an *Eternal Procession*, but a *Temporal*, which is the same with the *Spirits Mission*.

1. That they do not assert the *Eternal Procession* of the Spirit from the Son, but the *Consubstantiality* of the Spirit with the Son. And therefore no more can be inferred from them, but only the ὁμοούσιον which the *Greeks* constantly acknowledge. This they make probable by two things: 1. That, when the *Fathers* dispute with those who denied the *Consubstantiality* of Son and Spirit, they use not the Particle *ex*, but only say that the Spirit is the Spirit of the Son. So *Cyril* expressly, when *Theodoret* had denied the *Procession* from the Son,

he

Ἐκπορεύεται μὲν γὰρ ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ πα-
τρὸς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, κατὰ τὸ ὅτι
σαπφὶς φωνήν, ἀλλ' ἐκ ἀλλοτρίου ἔστι
τὸ ὄν. Cyril. Alexan. Tom. 6.
edit. Paris. p. 229.

Ὁ περὶ τοῦ μὲν ἀπρίτως ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς.
ἔστι δὲ καὶ τὸ ὄν ἀλλότριον, κατὰ τὸ ὅτι
ἑστίας λόγον. Acta Theolog. Wit-
tenberg. Resp. 2. Patriarch.
p. 202.

Gregorius Palamas, c. 1. apud
Petavium Dogmat. Theolog. de
Trin. To. 2. l. 7. c. 18. ἔστι δὲ
διαίρεσις, ἢ δὲ τὸ διαφερόν, ἀλλὰ τὸ ἕνωσις,
καὶ τὸ ἀπαράλλακτον — καὶ τὸ ὁμο-
ούσιον.

Sect. 19.

Ubi supra.

Spalatenf.
de Rep. Ec-
cles. Tom.
3. l. 7. c.
10. Sect.
125.

he gives no other Answer, but this, *The Holy Spirit doth truly proceed from God and the Father, according to our Saviour's words, but is not of another Nature from the Son.* We see he contents himself with the acknowledgment that the Spirit is of the same Nature with the Son: To the same purpose is another Testimony of his produced by the Patriarch Hieremias; speaking of the Spirit whereby the Apostles spake, he says, *Which proceeded in an ineffable manner from the Father, but is not different from the Son in regard of his Essence.* Several other Testimonies are there produced by him, and elsewhere by others,

which need not be here recited. 2. That when they use the Particle *ex*, it is against those who denied the *Consubstantiality* both of the Son and Spirit; and therefore Gregorius Palamas lays down this Rule, *That, as often as the Prepositions, ex and per, have the same force in Divinity; they do not denote any division or difference in the Trinity, but only their Conjunction and inseparable Union, and consent of their Wills.* For which, he cites the famous Epistle of Maximus to Marinus, which was made the Foundation of the Union at the Council of Florence, who therein saith, that when the Latins said in their Syno-

dical Epistle, sent to Constantinople, that the Spirit did proceed *ex filio*, they meant no more than to shew τὸ συναφές τῆς ἑστίας καὶ ἀπαράλλακτον, the perfect and inseparable Union of the Divine Essence. So when St. Basil saith, that the Father did Create the World, *per filium*; he adds, that notes no more than τὸ ἡνωμένον τῷ θελήματι, the Conjunction of their Wills. And by this means the Greeks interpret all those Passages of the Fathers, which seem most express for the Spirits proceeding *ex filio*. So Marcus Ephesus tells the Latins in the Florentine Council, that when we say, Man comes ἐκ τῆς ἑστίας, from the Essence of a Man, therein is not implied, that the Essence of Man is the productive cause of Man, but only it notes the τὸ ὁμόσιον, that Communion of Essence which is in Men; so, when the Greek Fathers speak of the Spirit's proceeding *ex Filio*, that doth not imply that the Son is the Principle of Spiration, but that there is a Communion of Essence between the Son and the Spirit. So, when Athanasius disputing against the Arians (saith the Patriarch Hieremias) saith, that the Spirit ἐξ αὐτοῦ τῷ υἱῷ from the Son, is given to all; and that the Father διὰ τοῦ λόγου, ἐν τῷ πνεύματι, by the Son, in the Spirit, doth create, work, and give all things; you must consider, that Athanasius was then disputing against the Arians, who made both Son and Spirit to be Creatures: That therefore he might shew that the Spirit was of the same Substance with the Father and the Son; he therefore useth that Preposition *ex*, ἐγκαίρως καὶ ἀμφοτέρως very opportunely and conveniently. Therefore, saith he, *It is to be observed, that he never useth this but in opposition to the Arians, and such who denied the Divinity of the Holy Ghost.* To which purpose it is well observed by Spalatenf., that when the Fathers of the Constantinopolitan Council did insert into their Creed the Article of the Spirits Procession from the Father; they did it not with a purpose to define any thing concerning the Procession as an Article of Faith, but that they might from those words of St. John infer the Divinity of the Holy Ghost, because it proceeds from the Father: And withal, it is

is further observable, that in the *Creed*, which *Charissus* delivered in to, and was accepted by the Council of *Ephesus*, all that he says as to the *Holy Ghost*, is, *And in the Spirit of Truth, the Paraclet, who is Consubstantial with the Father and the Son.* By which, that which *Spalatensis* saith is much confirmed; for this Symbol of *Charissus* was accepted by the Council as agreeable to the *Nicene Creed*. *Act. 6. p. 360.*

Thus we see, how probable this Answer of the *Greeks* is, That the Intention of the *Fathers* in those Expressions is only to assert the *Consubstantiality* of the *Spirit* with the *Father* and the *Son*, because when they used them it was in their Disputes with them who denied it. And therefore *Petavius* spends his pains to very little purpose, when going about to take off this Answer of the *Greeks*, he only shews that those Expressions in themselves cannot be confined meerly to the signification of the *Consubstantiality* of the Persons, whereas the main force of this answer lies in the intention and scope of the Persons who used them, and the Adversaries they disputed against, and not in the importance of the Articles themselves.

2. The second Answer of the *Greeks*, is, that most of those places which speak of the Procession of the *Spirit* from the *Son*, are not to be understood of the *Eternal Procession*, but of the *Temporal*, which is the same with the *Spirit's Mission*. This, as the rest of the *Greeks*, so the *Patriarchs Hieremias* and *Cyril* especially insist upon; the first in his last Answer to the *Divines of Wirtenberg*. For when they in their Reply to his second Answer, had produced several Testimonies of *Athanasius*, *Cyril*, *Epiphanius*, *Basil*, and *Nazianzen*, in behalf of the *Spirit's Procession* from the *Son*; he wonders at them, that having the plain and clear places both of *Scriptures* and *Fathers*, which do (as he saith) so openly proclaim the *Spirit's Procession from the Father only*, they should hope for relief from other obscure places, which are capable of a different interpretation. As from the word *ἐκ τοῦ υἱοῦ*, which only relates to the *Spirit's Manifestation*, and is quite different from the *ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς*, and so cannot imply his *Eternal Procession*. Therefore for the clearing the Controversie, and giving account of the Mistakes in it, he begins with the Signification of the *Spirit*, which when it is applied to the *Divine Spirit*, is capable of different Significations, being taken either for the several Gifts of the *Spirit*, or for the Person of the *Spirit*; and so, though the word *Procession* be taken in a peculiar manner for the *Eternal Procession* of the *Spirit*, yet it is not only sometimes attributed to the bestowing the forementioned Gifts, but likewise to the *Eternal Generation* of the *Son*; and therefore whenever they meet with the word *Procession* attributed to the *Spirit* with a respect to the *Son*, they must not presently infer the *Eternal Procession*, but the word there signifies no more than *διῆλθαι, μυσθῆναι, ἢ διδοῦναι*, i. e. that the *Spirit* doth come through, is sent, and given by the *Son*, which the *Fathers* often mention, the better thereby to assert the *Identity of Nature and Essence*, which is in the *Spirit* with the *Father* and *Son*. This he doth therein very largely explain, and endeavour to make it out, that this is the most proper Interpretation both of *Scripture* and *Fathers*, when they seem most clearly to speak of the *Procession* of the *Spirit* from the *Son*. The same likewise the *Patriarch Cyril* insists upon, who acknowledgeth these several words to be attributed to the *Spirit* in reference to the *Son* *διῆλθαι, ἐκχεῖν, ἐκπορεύεσθαι, ἐκτείνεσθαι*, and several others in the writings of the *Fathers*, all which he acknowledgeth to be true, but he denies that any of them do import a *Hypostatical Procession* of the

the *Spirit* from the *Son*, but that they all refer to the temporal Mission and Manifestation of the *Spirit* through *Christ*, under the *Gospel*. Whether this Answer will reach to all the places produced out of the *Fathers*, is not here my business to enquire, only that which is pertinent to my Purpose may be sufficiently inferred from hence, that the *Fathers* certainly were not *Definitive* in this *Controversie*, when their expressest Sentences seem capable of quite a different meaning to Wise and Learned Men, who, one would think, if the Belief of this Procession had been a Tradition of their Church, or fully expressed in the Writings of the *Fathers* of the *Greek Church*, could not be so ignorant or wilful, as either not to see this to have been their meaning, or supposing they had seen it, to persist in so obstinate a belief of the contrary. I can therefore with advantage return your words back again to you. It is to be considered, that for many hundred Years the whole *Greek Church* never believed this to be an Article of Faith; nay, the *Fathers* were so far from it, that both single and in General Councils they did plainly express the contrary; how then bears it any shew of probability, what some few of yesterday (forced to it by an impossibility of otherwise defending the Power and Infallibility of the Roman Church) affirm, that the Matter of this *Controversie* is so great and considerable, that it is sufficient to produce an Heresie on either side? Is not this to make *Fathers*, and General Councils, and consequently all Christendome for many hundred Years, quite blind, and themselves only clear and sharp-sighted? Which swelling Presumption, what Spirit it argues, and whence it proceeds, all those who have learnt from Reason, if not from St. Augustine, That Pride is the Mother of making Heresies in unnecessary Articles of Faith, will easily collect. Do not you see now, how unadvisedly those words came from you, which with so small variation in the manner of expression, and much greater truth in the matter of it, are returned upon your self?

§. 10.

But I go on still, if possible, to make you sensible, how much you have wronged the *Greek Church* in this charge of a fundamental Error in her for denying the Procession of the *Spirit* from the *Son*. Which shall be from hence, that although there were some who did as plainly deny this as ever the Modern Greeks did or do, yet they were far from being condemned for Heresie in so doing. For which we must consider, that although the *Fathers*, as we have already seen, did speak ambiguously in this matter, yet the first who appears openly and stoutly to have denied it, was *Theodoret*; which, being the rise of the *Controversie*, must be more carefully enquired into. It appears then, that a General Council being summoned by the Emperour *Theodosius* to meet at *Ephesus* concerning the Opinions of *Nestorius*, which were vehemently opposed by *Cyril* of *Alexandria*, and several *Egyptian* and *Asian Bishops*, who being there convened, proceeded to the deposition of *Nestorius* and Anathematizing his Doctrine, before *Johannes Antiochenus*, and several other *Bishops* who favoured *Nestorius*, were come to *Ephesus*. When these therefore came and found what had been done by the other *Bishops*, they being seconded by *Candidianus* there, and the Court-party at *Constantinople*, assemble apart by themselves, and proceed on the other side to a Deposition and Excommunication of *Cyril* and *Memnon*, who were the leaders of all the rest; and these make an *Anti-Synod* to the other, which consisted of Persons of several Interests and Persuasions, some *Pelagians*, some *Nestorians*, and others, more as Friends to *Nestorius* than his Opinions, as being his ancient Familiars and Acquaintance, did joyn with them to prevent his Deposition; among which, the chief were *Johannes Antiochenus*, and *Theodoret*. But before the Council, *Cyril* had published his twelve *Anathemas* against the Opinions of *Nestorius*: To these therefore, not only the *Oriental Bishops* gave an answer, but *John* the Patriarch

arch of Antioch particularly appoints *Theodoret* to refute them. The ninth Anathema of *Cyril* was against *Nestorius*, and all others who said, That *Christ* used the Holy Ghost as a distinct Power from himself, for the working of Miracles, and that did not acknowledge him to be the proper Spirit of *Christ*. *Theodoret* grants the first part, wherein he shews he was no *Nestorian*, but quarrels with the latter part; for, saith he, If by that he means that the Spirit is of the same nature with the Son, and that it proceeds from the Father, we acknowledge it together with him—but if by that he understands as though the Spirit had his subsistence from or by the Son, we reject it as Blasphemous and Impious. Was ever any thing in this kind spoken with greater heat and confidence than this was here by *Theodoret*? And if this had been looked on as *Heretical* at that time, can we possibly imagine that so zealous an Opposer of all Heresies, and especially of the *Nestorians*, as *St. Cyril* of Alexandria was, should so coolly and patiently pass this by as he doth? For all the answer he gives, is only that which was before cited out of him; that he acknowledgeth, *The Spirit doth proceed from the Father*, but yet ἐκ ἑτέρου ἔστι οὗ υἱοῦ, it is not of another Nature from the Son; but did not *Theodoret* expressly assert that, as well as *Cyril*? Is it then possible that any one who hath his Wits about him, should imagine, that if that Doctrine of *Theodoret* had been accounted *Heretical*, it being expressed in so vehement a manner as it is, it should have no other answer from *Cyril*, but only approving that which *Theodoret* confesseth, viz. the *Consubstantiality* of the Spirit with the Son? All the Answer which *Petavius* and others give, is so weak and trifling, that one may easily see how much they were put to it to find out any: Sometimes it was because *Cyril* was intent upon his Business, and therefore passed it by; as though he were so weak a Man as to let his Adversary broach *Heresie*, and say nothing to it, because it was not pertinent to the present Cause. But if it were not, it is an Argument the second Answer is false, viz. that *Theodoret* was herein a *Nestorian*; for if he were so, it could not be besides the business, but was a main part of it. Moreover, if this were a piece of *Nestorianism*, it is very strange the Fathers of that Council, when they purposely collected the Opinions of *Nestorius* out of his own Writings, should never make any mention at all of this, no not when they produce his Opinion concerning the Spirit of God. Why was it not then condemned and Anathematized as one of his Heresies? Why did not the Oriental Bishops, when they subscribed to the Deposition of *Nestorius*, and the Election of *Maximianus* at Constantinople, and sent a Confession of their Faith to *Cyril* at Alexandria by *Paulus Emesenus*, mention this among the rest of their Agreement with the Orthodox Bishops? Yet in that extant both in *Cyril's* Works, and in the third part of the Council at Ephesus, there is not the least intimation of it. And therefore the learned Jesuit *Sirmondus*, in the Life of *Theodoret*, prefixed by him to the first Tome of his Works which he set forth, vindicates *Theodoret* from all suspicion of *Nestorianism*, and imputes all the Troubles which he fell into on that account to the violence of *Dioscorus* the Successor of *Cyril* at Alexandria, who being a great Patron of the *Eutychians*, thought to revenge himself on *Theodoret*, by blasting his Reputation as a *Nestorian*. There is not then any shew of probability that this Opinion in *Theodoret* was condemned as a piece of *Nestorianism*, which certainly the whole Greek Church could not have been

Ἰδοὺ δὲ τὸ πνεῦμα ὡς υἱὸς, αἰ μὲν ὡς ὁμοφυὲς καὶ Πατρὸς ἐκπροσενύμφον ἔφη, συνομολογήσαντες, αἰ δὲ ὡς ἐξ ἑτέρου, ἢ δὲ υἱὸς ὁ παρ' ἐξ ἑτέρου, ὡς βλασφημίαν ἔφη, καὶ ὡς διουσιεὶς ἀπερίφρουτος.
Theodoret c. Cyril. Anath. Tom. 4. p. 718. ed. Sirmond. Concil. Ephes. part. 3. p. 497. ed. Bin.

Cyril. Tom. 6. p. 229.

Dogmat. Theol. Tom. 2. l. 7. c. 18.

c. 1.

Concil. Ephes. Part. 2. Act. 1. p. 177.

Part. 3. p. 596.

ignorant of, from that time to this. But though that piece of *Theodoret* against *Cyril's Anathema's* were condemned in succeeding Councils, yet that might be for the defence of other things, which they judged bordered too near on *Nestorianism*, or because they would not have any Monument remain of that Discord between the *Oriental Bishops*, and the *Ephesine Council*; which *Theodosius* doth so much, and so heartily lament in his excellent Epistle to *Johannes Antiochenus* about a Reconciliation between him and *Cyril*, after the Banishment of *Nestorius*, and the choice of *Maximianus*. Thus we see one who in a divided and busie time ventured upon the absolute denial of the Procession of the *Holy Ghost* from the *Son* not as a bare Error, but as *Impious and Blasphemous*, yet was far from being condemned for Heretical himself for saying so, by those *Fathers*, who were the most zealous defenders of the true *Apostolical Faith*. And if these things considered together, do not make it appear that the *Fathers* did not make the denial of the Procession of the *Holy Ghost* from the *Son* to be a Heresie, I know not what can be made plain from them.

§. 11. But I know, whatever the *Fathers* say, you are of *Cornelius Mussus* his mind, who heartily professed, that he preferred the judgment of one *Pope*, before a thousand *Augustines* and *Hieroms*; but what if the *Pope* should prove of the same mind with the *Fathers*, how then can this be accounted an Heresie? And that they were exactly of the same mind, might be made appear by the several Epistles of *Vigilius* and *Agatho*, in confirmation of the Faith established in the four first General Councils, in which it was determined, that all necessities were already in the *Creed*, and that there needed no further Additions to it, both which are produced and insisted on by the *Greeks* in the fifth Session at *Ferrara*. But I pass by them, and come to more particular Testimonies of *Popes*, and that either in Councils, or upon a Reference to them from Councils. The first time we read of this Controversie in the *Western Churches* was about *Anno Dom. 767.* in the time of *Constantius Copronymus*, upon which in the time of *Pepin King of France*, there was a Synod held at *Gentilly near Paris* for determining a Controversie between the *Greeks* and *Latins* about the *Trinity*, as appears by the several Testimonies of *Ado* and *Rhegino* in their *Chronicles*, produced by *Pithæus*, *Petavius*, and others: But little more is left of that Convention, besides the bare mention of it; but it seems the Ashes were only raked over these Coals then, which about two and forty Years after, *Anno Dom. 809.* broke out into a greater Flame; for as appears by the Testimonies of the same *Ado*, and *Adelmus* or *Ademarus*, a Synod was held at *Aquisgrane*, about this very Question, Whether the Spirit did proceed from the *Son* as well as the *Father*; which Question, they say, was started by one *John* a Monk of *Jerusalem*, which Monk *Pithæus* supposeth to be *Johannes Damascenus*, who after *Theodoret* most expressly denied the Procession from the *Son*; but whether it was he or any other, it seems from that Council called by *Charles the Great*, there were several Legates (called *Apocrisarii*) dispatched to *Rome* to know the judgment of the present *Pope Leo 3.* concerning this Controversie; the Legates were *Bernarius*, *Jesse*, and *Adalhardus*, the two former the Bishops of *Worms* and *Amiens*, the latter the Abbot of *Corbey*. But *Petavius* herein betrays either his *Fraud* or *Inadvertency*, that he will by no means admit that these came to the *Pope* to know his judgment concerning the Procession it self, but only concerning the Addition of the *Filioque* to the *Creed*, which now began to be used in the *Gallican Churches* with that Addition. But although I grant that the main of their Business was concerning the Addition of *Filioque*, by the same token

Part. 3. p.
581.

Concil. Flo-
rent. sess. 5.
p. 593.

Pithæus O-
pus. de pro-
ces. S. S.
p. 26.
Petav.
Dogm. The-
ol. Tom. 2.
l. 7. c. 1.

token that *Leo* condemned it, as will appear afterwards ; yet that brought on the Discourse concerning the Doctrine it self of the *Procession* from the Son. For in the *Acts* of *Smaragdus* which were sent to *Charles the Great*, giving an account of this Controversie, which are published both by *Baron. Annal. ad An. 809. Sirmonius*, and *Sirmondus* ; it appears that when they urge the Pope for his Consent to the Addition of *Filioque*, they make use of this Argument, That it was a Matter of Faith, and therefore none should be ignorant of it ; upon which they ask the Pope this Question ; *Whether if any one doth not know or doth not believe this Article, he could be saved ?* To

which the Pope returns this wise and cautions Answer. *Whosoever by the Subtilty of his Wit can reach to the knowledge of it, and knowing it, will not believe it, he cannot be saved. For there are many things, of which this is one, which being the deeper Mysteries of Faith, to the knowledge of them many can attain, but many others cannot, being hindred either through want of Age, or Capacity ; and therefore, as we said before, he that can and will not, shall not be saved.* I pray, Sir, do me the Favour to let me know your Judgment, whether this Pope were infallible or no ? Or, will you acknowledge that he was quite *beside the Cushion*, that is, not *in Cathedra* when he spake it ? What ? Not then, when solemn Legates were dispatched from a Council purposely to know his Judgment in a Matter of Controversie, which the Church was divided about ? If so, the Pope shall never be *in Cathedra* but when you will have him ; or if he were there, you will surely say, he did not act very Apostolically, when he spake these words. For, can any thing be more plain, than that the Pope determines this Article of the *Procession* from the Son, to be no necessary Article of Faith ; but acknowledgeth it to be one of the deeper *Mysteries of Religion* which none were obliged to believe, but such as could reach to the knowledge of it ; which either want of Age in some, Capacity in others, and invincible Prejudice in many more, might keep them from the knowledge of ? Thus it appears by the Pope's Judgment, the denial of this could be no Heresie then, because he declares it, not to be necessary to be believed by all. What now must we think of this Pope, if we apply your words to him ? *Were all other succeeding Ages blind, and this Pope only clear and sharp-sighted ? Which Judgment of his must be called nothing short of swelling Presumption ;* and if you please *St. Austin* shall be quoted for it too, but it must be in some other place, besides that where he says, that *Pride is the Mother of Heresie*. Do you think we can do other than hugely applaud our selves, in seeing you so furiously lay about you, when we know, your first Blows fall on the *Fathers*, and your second cut off one Leg at least of your *Infallible Chair*. Can we have better Security against you than the Judgment of one of your own Popes ? May we not well be accounted blind, when for our sakes *Infallibility* it self must be so to ? If you tell us that after-Popes declared otherwise : I have but one Request to make to you, viz. To make it appear, that when two Popes shall determine both parts of a *Contradiction* to be true, they both are *Infallible* in doing so ?

Quisquis ad hoc sensu subtiliori pertingere potest, & id scire, aut ita sciens, credere noluerit, salvus esse non poterit. Sunt enim multa, & quibus istud unum est, sacra fidei altiora mysteria, ad quorum indagacionem pertingere multi valent : multi vero aut atatis quantitate, aut intelligentia qualitate prapediti non valent ; & ideo, ut praximus, qui potuerit, & noluerit, salvus esse non poterit. Apud Sirmond. ubi supra.

But if we proceed a little further, it may be we shall find the Judgment of another Pope agreeing with this. For which we must consider that *Anno Dom. 858. Ignatius the Patriarch of Constantinople* being Imprisoned by the Emperour *Michael*, and *Photius* being placed in his room, in a Council held by *Photius*, *Anno Dom. 861. Ignatius* was condemned, upon which he being likewise condemned by *Pope Nicolaus* at *Rome*, he doth as much

much for him at *Constantinople*. So that those Grudges which had been before more closely carried between the *Greeks* and *Latins*, did now openly discover themselves. But among several other things which *Photius* charged the *Latin Church* with, the chiefest, and that which he insists on

with the greatest vehemency, is, *That they did attempt to Corrupt and Adulterate the Holy and Sacred Symbol of Faith, which had obtained an unalterable Force by the Decrees of Synods and Councils, with false Senses and new Additions, by an unmeasurable Confidence. O their Diabolical Machinations! for by a strange Innovation, they make the Holy Ghost proceed not only from the Father, but the Son too.* This we find in his *Encyclical Epistle*, Published by him on the account of the Difference between the *Latin* and the *Greek Church*, in which he largely

καὶ τὸ ἱερὸν καὶ ἁγίον Σύμβολον, ὃ πᾶσι τοῖς Συνεδηκοῖς καὶ οἰκουμενικοῖς Φηρίσ-
μασιν, ἀμαχὸν ἔχει καὶ ἰσχύ, νόμοις
λογισμοῖς, καὶ παρεγγράφοις λόγοις,
καὶ θράσους ὑπερβολῇ κωδηλαδίην ἐπε-
χείρησαν· ὃ τῶν τῶ πορνῶν μηχανημά-
των! τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἁγίον ἐκ ἐκ τῶ
Πατρὸς μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐκ τοῦ υἱοῦ,
ἐκπερσύνεται, καινολογήσαντες. Photius
ep. 7. p. 51.

disputes against the Doctrine of the *Procession of the Spirit from the Son*, and, as we see, charges the *Latins* with Fraud, Presumption, and a desire of Innovation, in the inserting that Article into the *Creed*. Not long after, this *Pope Niclaus* having advised with the *Gallican Bishops* what to do in this business, dies; to whom *Adrian* succeeds as bitter against *Photius* as his Predecessor, and had more advantage against him than the other had. For, at *Constantinople* the *Emperour Michael* being slain by *Basilins*, whom he had adopted to a Partnership in the *Empire* the Year before, he presently banisheth *Photius*, restoreth *Ignatius*, calleth a *Council*, A. D. 869. in which *Photius* is *Anathematized*; and, for the greater Execration of him, they dipt their Pens wherewith they subscribed, in the sacred *Chalice*. This the *Latins* call the eighth *Oecumenical Synod*. Notwithstanding all which, *Ignatius* being dead, *Photius* is restored by *Basilins Macedo*, Anno Dom. 878. Legates are dispatched to *Pope John 8*. (as in Courtesie to you we call him) who succeeded *Adrian*, that *Photius* might be restored to the Communion of the Church and his *Patriarchal Dignity*; which is presently done. The Year following, a *General Council* is held at *Constantinople*, in which the *Pope's Legates* are present, and this the *Greeks* only admit for the eighth *Oecumenical*. In which all that was done against *Photius* is abrogated, the *Constantinopolitan Creed* without the Addition of *Filioque* is solemnly read, and it is decreed against the *Latins*, the *Pope's Legates* consenting, that nothing should be added to the *Creed*. But lest you should think the *Pope's Legates* were practised upon by some Arts of *Photius* (for some of his Enemies among other Reproaches, did not stick to say, he learnt *Magick* from the famous *Santarabennus*) and that it was done without the *Pope's* free Consent: We have his own Testimony afterwards in approbation of it. For *Pi-*
ethaus, an Ingenuous, as well as very Learned Man, confesseth, that the Letters of this *Pope* are still extant among the *Latins*, by which it appears that he condemned all the *Synods* held against *Photius*, whether at *Rome* or *Constantinople*; and the *Patriarch Hieremias* (whose Testimony in other cases you make much of) saith expressly, not only that the *Pope* consented to this *Synod*, by the *Cardinal Peter*, and *Paulus*, and *Eugenius* who were there his *Legates*; but that in an *Epistle* he writ to *Photius*, he hath these words. *I declare again to your Grace, concerning that Article, by which such Scandals have been in the Churches of Christ. Assure your self, that we not only speak this, but that*

that we really judge, Those who first durst out of their Presumption do this, to be Transgressors of the sacred Oracles, changers of the Doctrine of our Lord Christ, and the Holy Fathers, and we place them in the Society of Judas. What Article was this, I pray, which the Pope is so zealous against? Even no other than that which you account all blind who do not esteem the denial of it Heresie. It seems then we have one more added to the number of the Heretical Popes; for, Photinus himself could not express more Vehemency against this Article than the Pope doth, and that when by his Legates in a Council (therefore Infalible, according to you, because confirmed by the Pope)

he had declared himself utterly against the Addition of this *Article* to the *Creed*. And instead of accounting them Hereticks who denied it, you see how much worse than *Hereticks* he accounted them who first added it. So that I wonder, you do not rather account the belief of that *Article* *Heretic*, than the denial of it. I know well enough, how your Party rail here to purpose against *Photinus*; but what is all that to the Business? Let *Photinus* be what he will, Were not the *Pope's Legates* present at the *Council*? Did not they confirm the Decrees of it? Did not the *Pope* afterwards Ratify it? So that if ever Council were Infallible according to your Principles, this must be; choose therefore, either to relinquish the *Pope's* and *Councils* *Infallibility*, or else acknowledge that Men at one time may be infallibly guilty of violating *Scriptures*, *Fathers*, *Councils* for asserting that *Doctrine*, which they may be infallibly guilty of *Heresy* for not asserting at another. I know very well, that *Marinus* who succeeded *John 8.* at *Rome*, condemned his Predecessors Acts and *Photinus* together, (for he was before employed both by *Nicolaus* and *Adrian* in the Excommunicating and Condemning *Photinus*) but what this proves I understand not, any further, than that still one *Pope* may Infallibly contradict another, or that a *Pope* without a *Council* shall be more Infallible than with one; or lastly, (which is the grand *Arcanum Imperii*) those *Popes*, and those Decrees which are for the present Interest of the *Church of Rome* must be owned as Infal-
lible; but for the rest, the best Art must be used to blast them that may be. And for this you want not your many Tricks and Devices to accuse Authors of Forgery, cry out on them for Hereticks, rail out of measure when you have nothing else to say; or if after all this, Testimonies stand of force against you, then nothing is left, but *Excogitato commento detorque-
re in alium sensum*, to find out some Trick to wrest them to another Sense, as the Authors of the *Belgick Index Expurgatorius* professed in the Case of *Bertram*. But for all Men who think it not lawful to say any thing in a bad Cause, this may certainly be sufficient to shew, that if *Fathers* and *Councils* may be relied on, if *Popes* and *Councils* be Infallible, that was not account-
ed an Heresy by them, which you condemn for such in the *Greek Church*.

Having thus discovered, that this Opinion you condemn for *Heretic* in the *Greek Church*, was otherwise esteemed both by *Fathers, Oecumenical Councils, and Popes*; I come to that which you seem to rely on for making it Heretical, *viz. That the Greeks and Latins both together condemned it for Heretical in the General Council at Florence*. Although it might be worth our while to enquire how far any *General Council* can either make or declare that to be a necessary Article of Faith, which was determined to be otherwise by former *General Councils*. But omitting that at present which

Πάλιν παραδιδύμαται τῷ σὺ αἰδομένῳ
 τῷ, οὗ τῷ ἔργῳ τῷ, δι' ὃ συνέβη τῷ
 συνέβη αὐτῷ τῷ ἔκκλησιαν τῷ χριστῷ
 ἔχῃ πρὸς ἡμᾶς πλεονεξίας, ὅτι ἡ μόνον
 λατρεία τῷ, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸς πρώτους
 διαφθορίας τῷ αὐτῶν ἀπορίᾳ τῷ
 ποιῶν, παρὰ τὰς κρίσεις τῶν θείων
 λόγων, καὶ μελετηρίας τῷ διολογίας τῷ
 διεστῆκε χριστῷ, καὶ τῶν ἀγίων πατέρων
 καὶ μετὰ τῷ ἱερεὶ αὐτοῖς πάντοτε.
 Acta Theolog. Wirtenberg.
 Resp. 2. Patriarch. p. 213,
 214.

which we may have a fitter occasion to discuss in the Question of *Fundamentals*, and the *Infallibility of General Councils*; I therefore come to examine the Matter of Fact in the *Florentine Council*, concerning the determination of this Opinion there as *Heretical*. Wherein if we consider the time in which, and the occasion upon which this Council was call'd, if we consider the way of the managery of it, the *Arts* whereby the *Greeks* were drawn to this consent, the manner of proposing the *Decrees* of it, or the acceptance which it found in the *Greek Church*, upon none of these respects we shall have cause to look upon it as a *Free and General Council*, determining that Opinion as *Heretical*, which you say was so determined here. In all which we must profess how much we are obliged to that faithful and impartial Account of all the Proceedings relating to this Council, written by *Sylvester Sguropulus*, one present at the most secret Negotiations of it, transcribed out of the MS. in the King of France his Library, by *Claudius Serravins*, and first published for the general Good of the World by our Learned *Dean of Wells*. It appears then, that which gave the first rise to the thoughts of Union between the *Greek and Latin Churches*, was the miserable condition which the *Greek Empire* was now reduced to, by the Incurfions of the *Turks and Saracens*. For it seems for thirty Years, (before that an *Embassadour* was sent to *Rome* from *Manuel Palaeologus* to negotiate the Business of the Union) from the time of the *Patriarch Nilus*, and *Pope Urban*, there had been no intercourse at all between the *Popes* and *Patriarchs*, but now upon this Address made to them by the *Greeks*, the *Popes* cares them with all imaginable Kindness, feed them high with Promises, engage their utmost to promote this Union, (well knowing with what Advantage to themselves it might be managed in this Critical Juncture of their Affairs.) For now *Amurath 2.* having subdued *Peloponnesus*, had advanced almost to the Walls of *Constantinople*, and therefore when the *Pope* sent one to the *Emperour* and *Patriarch* to appoint a Day for the Council, they told him they could not then have leisure to think of Councils; and if they had, by reason of the Fury of the Wars the *Bishops* could not be assembled together to make a full Council. But it seems the State of Affairs grew worse still with them, and the *Dead-palse* of *Manuel Palaeologus* was but an *Emblem* of a worse in the State, the *Empire* being brought daily into greater Dangers. Which put *Johannes Palaeologus* upon further thoughts, how any Help or Relief might be had from the *West* in this Extremity. But they might easily understand the Terms of that Union from the Speech of the *Cardinals* to the *Emperour's Legates*, That the *Roman Church* was the *Mother*, and the *Eastern* only the *Daughter*, and therefore it was but fit that the *Daughter* should submit to the *Mother*; That for their parts, they would not leave the Decision of this Controversie to multitudes of Voices, (it seems then they had high thoughts of the *Infallibility of General Councils*) but three should be chosen on either side, who being apart by themselves should invoke *God*, and whatever he should reveal to them, that all should consent to: For he that hath said, that *Where two or three are gathered together in his Name he would be in the midst of them*; he that made the *As* to speak (the Cardinal's own Argument) would not fail of letting them know his Will Infallibly, which was to be received from them by all others. (There may be then a much readier way for Infallibility, than by *Pope and Councils*.) But if nothing else would satisfy but a Council, it must be in *Italy*, contrary to the *Pope's* Promise before, that it should be at *Constantinople*; but when they urged the vastness of the Expence, and unsuitableness of it to their present Necessities; rather than a matter like-

Sylvester
Sguropul.
Histo. Con-
cil. Florent.
secl. 2. c.
16.

Secl. 2. c.
12.

ly to be so much for the advantage of the *See of Rome* should not go forward, the *Pope* proffers to advance a considerable Sum of Money for the defraying the Charges of the *Greeks*, both in coming to, and abiding at the *Council*. Which those who understand not the *Intrigues* of that *Court*, would have thought had been far better spent in a present supply of the *Greek Emperour*, the better to have enabled him to defend the *Christian Churches* from the Invasion of their Enemies. But any one who looks into the management of things, will easily discern upon what grounds the *Pope* chose rather a dilatory proceeding, drawing the *Emperour* and so many *Bishops* from *Greece* into *Italy* at that time, and all the while to feed them with rich Promises of Assistance, upon condition that the *Union* was accomplished; but at last after two years attendance (for so long the *Council* continued at *Ferrara* and *Florence*) the poor *Emperour* was sent home as empty as he came, and found things in a much worse condition than he left them. Which could not rationally be expected to be otherwise. When the *Greeks* knew C. 17. 18. that the *Emperour* had assented that the *Council* should be in *Italy*, they began strangely to be troubled at it, some resolved never to communicate more in the *Councils* of the *Union*; the *Patriarch* often said, that he knew no good Issue could come of a *Council* held in the *Pope's Territories*; and if they must receive their allowance from the *Pope*, what did they else but therein confess themselves his *Vassals* already, and therefore nothing could be expected from them, but to do just what he would have them; or else he might easily starve them into consent and approbation of his Will. For they should be wholly under his Power, and if he denied their Stipends, there was no possibility of getting from him. Was not this then like to be a very free *Council*? And it proved accordingly: For when they were at *Council* the *Pope* kept them short enough, so that many of them were reduced to the greatest Necessities, and were not suffered unless by stealth to go so much as out of the *Gates* of the City, as *Bessarion* himself once found, Sess. 6. c. 1. when he attempted it at *Florence*. But notwithstanding all the persuasions of the wisest of his *Councillors* at home to the contrary, notwithstanding Sess. 3. c. 12. an Express from the *Emperour Sigismund* to dissuade the *Greek Emperour* in the present state of Affairs from this Journey into *Italy*, yet he was resolved upon it, and used all the Arts he could before-hand to make choice of such Persons as might be most for his purpose. Himself, without the consent of the *Patriarch*, appointing the *Legates* of the three other *Patriarchs* Sess. 3. c. 3. of *Jerusalem*, *Antioch*, and *Alexandria*: And when these *Patriarchs* had 3. given no other Instructions to these *Legates*, than that they should have power to give their Suffrages upon these Terms, and no other, *That all things were carried fairly, and defined Canonically, according to the Decrees of Oecumenical Councils and Holy Fathers, so that nothing should be added, changed, or innovated in the Symbol of Faith*; he, at the Instigation of one of the *Latin Legates*, then Resident at *Constantinople*, sent away to the several *Patriarchs*, for the altering their Instructions, upon a solemn Promise that the Conditions mentioned by them should however be exactly observed: Which whether they were or no, will appear by the Series of the Story. And that we may better judge how General this *Council* was like to be, at the same time that these Negotiations for *Union* were on foot, the *Council of Basil* was then sitting in opposition to *Pope Eugenius*; to them and to the *Pope* at the same time, the *Emperour* dispatched several *Legates* with the same Instructions, and both of them returned theirs to the *Emperour*, seeking as much as possible to outvy each other in large Promises if the *Greeks* did Cap. 12. joyn in *Council* with them; both which the *Emperour* held in play till he

E

could

- could see with whom he was like to make the best Terms. But as the *Romanists* are never backward at such Arts, they had caused it by their Instruments to be reported at *Constantinople*, that the *Council* at *Basil* had submitted to the *Pope*, which within fifteen days was confuted by the arrival of the *Galleys* sent from the *Council* to convey the *Greeks* over to it; upon which the *Emperour* had much to do to keep *Condulmerius* the *Pope's* Nephew from fighting the *Council's* *Galleys* within his view; for he said, he had express Order from the *Pope* to sink them where ever he met them. And
- C. 11. were not these fair Tendencies to a Free and General Council? And yet after all this, not full thirty *Bishops* of the *Greek Church* went along with the *Patriarch*, as appears by the particular enumeration of them by *Sguropulus*: other *Officers* indeed, and *Monks*, there were to fill up the number; and yet these were more than the *Emperour* could well mould to his Designs
- Self. 6. c. 3. when he had them there. But the *Pope* soon accomplished the *Patriarch's* Prediction in keeping them bare enough, when they were at his finding, that he might be sure to make them hungry *Greeks*, and then he supposed the other part of the *Proverb* would follow after. After the *Council* had begun at *Ferrara*, and continued there sixteen *Sessions*, wherein were many publick and solemn Disputes between the *Greeks* and *Latins*, it was removed to *Florence*; where the *Greeks* still underwent the same Hardships, and the *Latins* sought to hold out at Disputations, till the *Greeks* Necessity should be so pressing, as to necessitate them to an absolute Submission to the *Latin Church*. But, Reports and Messages coming from *Constantinople*, acquainting the *Emperour* with the difficulties the City was in, and the Progress which the Enemies made; and finding, that during the sitting of the *Council* the *Pope* still put him off and gave him nothing but words, he therefore resolves upon another course; he breaks all Publick and Conciliary Proceedings, pretending that no Issue would come of those Disputations, calls a private Cabal of such whom he knew fittest for his purpose to contrive some shorter way to put an end to this Business. For that end, makes choice first of
- Self. 8. c. 12. ten Persons of either side to agree upon some Proposals for Union, and acquaints none else of the *Greeks* with their Transactions. When these things took no effect, the *Patriarch* who carried on the *Emperour's* design, often convenes the *Greeks* together, and in plain terms perswades them to perfect Dissimulation, that since the necessity of Affairs was such, it would be hugely for their advantage, if in some things they did yield to the *Latins* desires. When they told him, that in Matters of Faith they could not do it, he replies, that if in twenty four Articles of Faith they yielded but in one, the soundness of twenty three would make amends for the twenty fourth. Such kind of Arguments as these were they driven to, to bring the *Greeks* to harken to any Terms of Union. After this, the *Latins* sent them an Explication of Faith, which if the *Greeks* would subscribe, there might be an Union between them: Which being read among them, containing chiefly the acknowledgement of the *Procession from the Son*, all but the four who were the *Emperour's* Instruments in this Work, unanimously disown it: And when the
- C. 13. *Emperour* urged them every one to deliver their Suffrages in writings, they tell him, it was contrary to the proceeding of all *Oecumenical Councils*: However, he told them he commanded them to do it. By which means rebuking
- C. 16. some, cajoling others, he at last brought it by the multitude of Suffrages, that five Persons were selected among the rest, to draw up a Form of Union; which,
- C. 18. though drawn up very favourably for the *Greeks*, yet, those who were for it, did not easily carry it from those who opposed it. And yet to this the *Latins* returned no less than twelve Exceptions: Upon which the *Emperour*

perour was fain to take a new Course, and exclude those from the Councils, Sect. 9. c. 4.
 who were of greatest Authority in obstructing his Designs; but *Marcus*
Ephesus still continued in so great opposition, that he publicly charged C. 5.
 the *Latins* Opinion with *Hereſie*. Notwithstanding all which, when it
 was put to Suffrage, *Whether the Spirit did proceed from the Son*; for ten C. 8.
 who affirmed it, there were seventeen who denied it, which put them
 yet to more Disquietment, and new Councils. At first the *Emperour* would
 Vote himself, which when the *Patriarch* kept him from, some advised him
 to remove more of the Dissenters: But, instead of that, they used a more
 plausible and effectual way; the *Emperour* and *Patriarch* sent for them se-
 verally, and some they upbraided with Ingratitude, others they caressed
 with all Expressions of Kindness, both by themselves and their Instruments: C. 9.
 Yet, at the last, they could get but 13 *Bishops* to affirm the *Proceſſion from*
the Son, all others being excluded the Power of giving Suffrage; who were
 accustomed formerly to give it, such as the great Officers of the Church of
Constantinople, the *Cænobiarchs* and others; but to fill up the number, all C. 10.
 the *Courtiers* were called in, who made no dispute, but did presently what
 the *Emperour* would have them do. Having dispatched this after this
 manner, the other Controversies concerning the *Addition to the Creed*, *un-*
leavened Bread in the Eucharist, *Purgatory*, *Pope's Supremacy*, the *Emperour*
 agreed them privately, never so much as communicating them to the
Greek Synod. Among the *Emperour's* Instruments, the *Bishop of Mitylene* Sect. 10. c.
 went roundly to work, saying openly, *Let the Pope give me so many Florens*
to be distributed to whom I think fit, and I make no question but to bring them in
very readily to subscribe the Union; which he accordingly effected; and the C. 4.
 same way was taken with several others: By which, and other Means,
 most of those who were excluded from the Suffrages, were at last persuaded
 to *Subscribe*. This is the short account of the Management of those Affairs
 at *Florence*, which are more particularly and largely prosecuted by the
 Author, wherein we see what *Clandestine Arts*, what *Menaces*, and *Insin-*
uations, what *Threats* and *Promises* were used to bring the poor *Greeks*
 to consent to this pretended *Union*. For it afterwards appeared to be no
 more than pretended; for the infinitely greater number of *Bishops* at home
 refused it, and these very *Bishops* themselves, when they saw what *Arts*
 were used in it, fell off from it again, and the *Emperour* found himself at
 last deceived in his great expectations of help from the *Latins*. Must we
 then acknowledge this for a *Free and General Council*, which hath a *Pro-*
mise of Infallibility annexed to the Definitions of it? Shall we from hence
 pronounce the *Greeks Doctrine* to be *Heretical*, when for all these *Procee-*
dings, yet at last no more was agreed on, than that they did both believe
the Proceſſion from the Son, without condemning the other Opinion as *He-*
retical, as you pretend, which the *Greeks* would never have consented to?
 Or *Anathematizing* the Persons who denied it, as was usual in former *Ge-*
neral Councils, who did suppose it not enough to have it virtually done by
 the positive Definition, but did expressly and formally do it. For when
 this *Anathematizing* Dissenters was propounded among the *Greeks* by *Bes-*
sarion of Nice, and *Isidore of Russia* (who for their great Service to the
Pope in this Business were made *Cardinals*) it was refused by the rest, who
 were zealous promoters of the *Union*. This I have at large (more out of
 a design to vindicate the *Greek Church*, than being necessitated to it by any
 thing you produce) shewed, that there is no reason from *Authority*, either
 before or after the Council of *Florence*, to charge the *Greek Church* with
Hereſie.

- could see with whom he was like to make the best Terms. But as the *Romanists* are never backward at such Arts, they had caused it by their Instruments to be reported at *Constantinople*, that the *Council* at *Basil* had submitted to the *Pope*, which within fifteen days was confuted by the arrival of the *Galleys* sent from the *Council* to convey the *Greeks* over to it; upon which the *Emperour* had much to do to keep *Condulmerius* the *Pope's* Nephew from fighting the *Council's* *Galleys* within his view; for he said, he had express Order from the *Pope* to sink them where ever he met them. And
- C. 11. were not these fair Tendencies to a Free and General Council? And yet after all this, not full thirty *Bishops* of the *Greek Church* went along with the *Patriarch*, as appears by the particular enumeration of them by *Sguropulus*: other *Officers* indeed, and *Monks*, there were to fill up the number; and yet these were more than the *Emperour* could well mould to his Designs
- Self. 6. c. 3. when he had them there. But the *Pope* soon accomplished the *Patriarch's* Prediction in keeping them bare enough, when they were at his finding, that he might be sure to make them hungry *Greeks*, and then he supposed the other part of the *Proverb* would follow after. After the *Council* had begun at *Ferrara*, and continued there sixteen *Sessions*, wherein were many publick and solemn Disputes between the *Greeks* and *Latins*, it was removed to *Florence*; where the *Greeks* still underwent the same Hardships, and the *Latins* sought to hold out at Disputations, till the *Greeks* Necessity should be so pressing, as to necessitate them to an absolute Submission to the *Latin Church*. But, Reports and Messages coming from *Constantinople*, acquainting the *Emperour* with the difficulties the City was in, and the Progress which the Enemies made; and finding, that during the sitting of the *Council* the *Pope* still put him off and gave him nothing but words, he therefore resolves upon another course; he breaks all Publick and Conciliary Proceedings, pretending that no Issue would come of those Disputations, calls a private *Cabal* of such whom he knew fittest for his purpose to contrive some shorter way to put an end to this Business. For that end, makes choice first of
- Self. 8. c. 12. ten Persons of either side to agree upon some Proposals for Union, and acquaints none else of the *Greeks* with their Transactions. When these things took no effect, the *Patriarch* who carried on the *Emperour's* design, often convenes the *Greeks* together, and in plain terms perswades them to perfect Dissimulation, that since the necessity of Affairs was such, it would be hugely for their advantage, if in some things they did yield to the *Latins* desires. When they told him, that in Matters of Faith they could not do it, he replies, that if in twenty four Articles of Faith they yielded but in one, the soundness of twenty three would make amends for the twenty fourth. Such kind of Arguments as these were they driven to, to bring the *Greeks* to harken to any Terms of Union. After this, the *Latins* sent them an Explication of Faith, which if the *Greeks* would subscribe, there might be an Union between them: Which being read among them, containing chiefly the acknowledgement of the *Procession from the Son*, all but the four who were the *Emperour's* Instruments in this Work, unanimously disown it: And when the
- C. 13. *Emperour* urged them every one to deliver their *Suffrages* in writings, they tell him, it was contrary to the proceeding of all *Oecumenical Councils*: However, he told them he commanded them to do it. By which means rebuking
- C. 14. some, cajoling others, he at last brought it by the multitude of *Suffrages*, that five Persons were selected among the rest, to draw up a *Form of Union*; which,
- C. 16. though drawn up very favourably for the *Greeks*, yet, those who were for it, did not easily carry it from those who opposed it. And yet to this the *Latins* returned no less than twelve *Exceptions*: Upon which the *Emperour*
- C. 18.

perour was fain to take a new Course, and exclude those from the Councils, Sect. 9. c. 4. who were of greatest Authority in obstructing his Designs; but *Marcus Ephesus* still continued in so great opposition, that he publickly charged the *Latins* Opinion with *Hereſie*. C. 5. *Notwithstanding all which, when it was put to Suffrage, *Whether the Spirit did proceed from the Son*; for ten C. 8. who affirmed it, there were seventeen who denied it, which put them yet to more Disquietment, and new Councils. At first the *Emperour* would Vote himself, which when the *Patriarch* kept him from, some advised him to remove more of the Dissenters: But, instead of that, they used a more plausible and effectual way; the *Emperour* and *Patriarch* sent for them severally, and some they upbraided with Ingratitude, others they caressed with all Expressions of Kindness, both by themselves and their Instruments: C. 9. Yet, at the last, they could get but 13 *Bishops* to affirm the *Proceſſion from the Son*, all others being excluded the Power of giving Suffrage; who were accustomed formerly to give it, such as the great Officers of the Church of *Constantinople*, the *Cænobiarchs* and others; but to fill up the number, all the *Courtiers* were called in, who made no dispute, but did presently what the *Emperour* would have them do. C. 10. Having dispatched this after this manner, the other Controversies concerning the *Addition to the Creed*, *unleavened Bread in the Eucharist*, *Purgatory*, *Pope's Supremacy*, the *Emperour* agreed them privately, never so much as communicating them to the *Greek Synod*. Among the *Emperour's* Instruments, the *Bishop of Mitylene* Sect. 10. c. went roundly to work, saying openly, *Let the Pope give me so many Florens* ¹ *to be distributed to whom I think fit, and I make no question but to bring them in very readily to subscribe the Union*; which he accordingly effected; and the C. 4. same way was taken with several others: By which, and other Means, most of those who were excluded from the *Suffrages*, were at last perswaded to *Subscribe*. This is the short account of the Management of those Affairs at *Florence*, which are more particularly and largely prosecuted by the Author, wherein we see what *Clandestine Arts*, what *Menaces*, and *Insinuations*, what *Threats* and *Promises* were used to bring the poor *Greeks* to consent to this pretended *Union*. For it afterwards appeared to be no more than pretended; for the infinitely greater number of *Bishops* at home refused it, and these very *Bishops* themselves, when they saw what *Arts* were used in it, fell off from it again, and the *Emperour* found himself at last deceived in his great expectations of help from the *Latins*. Must we then acknowledge this for a *Free and General Council*, which hath a *Promise of Infallibility* annexed to the Definitions of it? Shall we from hence pronounce the *Greeks Doctrine* to be *Heretical*, when for all these Proceedings, yet at last no more was agreed on, than that they did both believe the *Proceſſion from the Son*, without condemning the other Opinion as *Heretical*, as you pretend, which the *Greeks* would never have consented to? Or *Anathematizing* the Persons who denied it, as was usual in former *General Councils*, who did suppose it not enough to have it virtually done by the positive Definition, but did expressly and formally do it. For when this *Anathematizing* Dissenters was propounded among the *Greeks* by *Bessarion of Nice*, and *Isidore of Russia* (who for their great Service to the *Pope* in this Business were made *Cardinals*) it was refused by the rest, who were zealous promoters of the *Union*. This I have at large (more out of a design to vindicate the *Greek Church*, than being necessitated to it by any thing you produce) shewed, that there is no reason from *Authority*, either before or after the *Council of Florence*, to charge the *Greek Church* with *Hereſie*.

S. 14.

P. 6.

Sect. 9. n.
1. p. 24.

I now come to the Examination of your *Theological Reason*, by which you think you have so evidently proved the *Greeks* Opinion to be *Hereſie*, that you introduce it with Confidence in abundance. But, ſay you, *though this Perſwaſion had not been attested by ſuch clouds of Witneſſes, Theological Reason is ſo ſtrong a Foundation to confirm it, that I wonder how rational Men could ever be induced to queſtion the Truth of it.* Still you ſo unadviſedly place your Expreſſions, that the ſharpeſt which you uſe againſt your Adverſaries return with more force upon your ſelf: For it being ſo fully cleared, that theſe *clouds of Witneſſes* are *Fathers, Councils, and Popes* againſt you. What do you elſe by this Expreſſion, but exclude them from the number of *Rational Men*, becauſe, forſooth, not acquainted with the depth of your *Theological Reason*? But, *Is not this to make all the Churches of Chriſtendom for many hundred years quite blind, and your ſelf only clear and ſharp ſighted? Which ſwelling Preſumption what Spirit it argues, &c.* You ſee we need no other Weapons againſt you, but your immediate preceeding words. What pity it is, that the *Fathers and Councils* had not been made acquainted with this grand Secret of your *Theological Reason*? But happy we that have it at ſo cheap a rate! but it may be that is it which makes us eſteem it no more. But ſuch as it is, it being *Reason and Theological* too, it deſerves the greateſt reſpect that may be, if it makes good its Title. His Lordſhip had ſaid, *That ſince the Greeks, notwithstanding this Opinion of theirs, deny not the Equality, or Conſubſtantiality of the Perſons in the Trinity, he dares not deny them to be a true Church for this Opinion, though he grants them Erroneous in it.* To this you reply, *Is it (think you) enough to aſſert the Divinity, and Conſubſtantiality, and Perſonal Diſtinction of the Holy Ghoſt (as the Biſhop ſays) to ſave from Hereſie the denial of his Proceſſion from the Father and the Son as from one Principle? But why is it not enough? Your Theological Reason is that we want, to convince us of the contrary; That therefore follows. Would not he that ſhould affirm the Son to be a diſtinct Perſon from, and Conſubſtantial to the Father, but denied his Eternal Generation from him, be an Heretick? Or he, who held the Holy Ghoſt, diſtinct from, and Conſubſtantial to them both, but affirmed his Proceſſion to be from the Son only, and not from the Father, be guilty of Hereſie? It is then moſt evident, that not only an Error againſt the Conſubſtantiality and Diſtinction, but againſt the Origination, Generation, and Proceſſion of the Divine Perſons, is ſufficient matter of Hereſie.* Your faculty at clinching your Arguments, is much better than of driving them in: For your Conclusion is moſt evident, when your Premises have nothing like Evidence in them. For, 1. He that doth acknowledge the Son to be Conſubſtantial with the Father, and yet a diſtinct Perſon from him, muſt needs therein acknowledge his *Eternal Generation*: For how he ſhould be the Son of the ſame Nature with God, and yet having a diſtinct Perſonality as a Son, without *Eternal Generation*; is ſo hard to underſtand, that I muſt confeſs, that whoever aſſerts the one, and denies the other, is ſo far from *Theological Reason*, that I think he hath no common Reason in him. Is this then, think you, a parallel Caſe with the Proceſſion of the Spirit from the Son, which may be ſuppoſed Conſubſtantial to Father and Son, and a diſtinct Perſon from both, without any Connotation of Reſpect to the Perſonality of the Son, as a Principle of Spiritation? 2. He that ſhould affirm the Proceſſion of the Spirit only from the Son, and not the Father, would ſpeak much more abſurdly than the *Greeks* do; for thereby he would deſtroy the Father's being the Fountain or Principle of Origination, as to the diſtinct *Hypoſtaſes* of Son and Spirit; he would plainly and directly thwart the Creed of the ſecond General

General Council; and, which is more, would speak directly against exprefs words of *Scripture*, which say, *The Spirit proceeds from the Father*: Which by the consent of the *Christian Church*, hath been interpreted of the *Eternal Procession*. And by this time, I hope you begin to have better Thoughts of Rational Men, than to make such a wonder at their questioning the *Greeks Heresie*; but if this be your *Theological Reason*, one *Scruple of common Reason* goes far beyond it.

We have had a fair Proof of your Skill at *Charging*, - we shall now see how good you are at standing your Ground. Your main Defence lies in a Distinction which ruins you; for you think to ward off all the Citations his Lordship produceth against you out of the *Schoolmen* and others, that the *Greeks* and *Latins* agree with each other, *in eandem fidei sententiam*, upon the same Sentence of Faith, but differ only in words, by saying, That the *Greeks* must be distinguished into *Ancient* and *Modern*. The *Ancient*, you say, expressed themselves per *filium*, but they meant thereby à *filio*: Whereas the *Modern Greeks* will not admit that Expression à *filio*: but per *filium* only, and that too in a Sense dissignificative to à *filio*. This is the Substance of all the Answer you give, both in general, and to the particular Authorities for several Pages; the Disproof therefore of this Distinction, must, by your own Confession, make all those Testimonies stand good against you; which I shall do by two things. 1. By shewing that the *Ancient Greeks* did assert as much as the *Modern* do in this Controversie. 2. That those who speak expressly of the *Modern Greeks*, do deny their difference from us in any Matter of Faith. 1. That the *Ancient Greeks* did assert as much as the *Modern* do. By the *Ancient Greeks*, we must here understand those who writ before the *Schoolmen*, whose Testimonies you would answer by this Distinction. Now nothing can be more clear, than that those *Greeks* who writ before them, did as peremptorily deny the *Procession from the Son*, as any of the *Modern Greeks* do. We have already produced the Testimony of *Theodoret*, who accounts the contrary Opinion Blasphemous and Impious; and that of *Photius*, who so largely and vehemently disputes against the *Procession from the Son*. To whom I shall add two more of great Reputation, not only in the *Greek*, but in the *Latin Church*; and those are *Theophylact* and *Damascent*. *Theophylact*, whether he lived in the time of *Photius*, about 870, as the common opinion is, or more probably in the time of *Michael Cerularius*, as great an Adversary as *Photius* to the *Latins*, about 1070, yet was long enough before the *Schoolmen*: For *Peter Lombard* flourished, A. D. 1145: and *Thomas* and *Bonaventure*, about 1260. So that in this respect he must be one of the *Ancient Greeks*; He therefore delivers his Opinion as expressly as may be in his *Commentaries* on *St. John*; and that not as his own private Opinion, but as the common Sense of the *Greek Church*; for there taking occasion to speak how the Spirit is the Spirit of the Son. For the *Latins*, saith he, apprehend it amiss, and mistaking it, say, That the Spirit proceeds from the Son. But we answer, That it is one thing to say, The Spirit is the Spirit of the Son, which we assert; and another, that it proceeds from the Son, which we deny; for it hath no Testimony of Scripture for it, and then we must bring in two Principles, the Father and the Son. And withal adds, that when Christ breathed the Spirit on his Disciples, it is not to be understood Personally, but in regard of the Gift of Remission of Sins; after which, he briefly and

§. 13.

P. 7. n. 5.

Theophylact. in Joh. 3. 26.

οἱ δὲ Λατίνοι καὶ οὕτως ταῦτα ἐνδεχόμενοι καὶ ἀγνοῦντες φασίν, ὅτι τὸ πνεῦμα ἐκ τοῦ υἱοῦ ἐκπορεύεται. Theophylact. in Joh. 3.

and comprehensively sets down the Opinion of the Greek Church:

Πίστευε σὺ τὸ πνεῦμα ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς μὴ
προϊέναι. δι' οὗ ὃ χορηγεῖσθαι τῇ κτί-
σει· καὶ ἔτι ἐστὶν οὐ καμὴν ὁρθοδοξίας.
Id. ib.

Believe thou that the Spirit doth proceed from the Father, but is given to Men by the Son; and let this be the Rule of sound Doctrine to thee. And what now do the Modern Greeks say more than Theophylact did? Or what do they say less; for they acknowledge, that the Spirit is the Spirit of the Son as well

as he? To the same purpose Damascen, who lived between the 6th and 7th Synod, about A. D. 730. in the time of Leo Isaurus, delivers the sense of the Greek Church in his time concerning this Article. It must be consi-

αὐτὸ γινώσκον, ὅτι τὸ πατέρα ἐ λέγομεν
ἐκ πνός, λέγομεν δὲ αὐτὸν τὸ οὐκ πα-
τέρα· τὸ δὲ οὐκ ἐ λέγομεν αἰνον, ἐδὲ
πατέρα· λέγομεν δὲ αὐτὸν καὶ ἐκ τοῦ
πατρὸς, καὶ οὐκ ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς· τὸ δὲ
πνεῦμα τὸ ἀγιον, καὶ ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς
λέγομεν, καὶ πνεῦμα πατρὸς ὀνομάζομεν,
ἐκ τοῦ οὐκ δὲ τὸ πνεῦμα ἐ λέγομεν
πνεῦμα δὲ οὐκ ὀνομάζομεν.—καὶ δι'
οὗ πεφανερῶνται καὶ μεταδίδονται ἡμῖν
ὁμολογεῖται. Joh. Damascenus de
Trinit. c. 8. & l. i. de Ortho-
doxa fide c. 11.

dered, saith he, That we assert not the Father to be from any, but that he is said to be the Father of the Son. We say not, that the Son is a proper Cause, neither the Father; but we say, the Son is from the Father, and of the Father. The Holy Spirit, we say, is from the Father, and of the Father; but we say not, the Spirit is from the Son, but we call him the Spirit of the Son; And we confess, that by the Son, the Spirit is manifested and given to us. These words are so plain, that the Patriarch Hieremias producing them, saith, Nothing can be more clear and evident than these words are. But the Philosopher, who was so much pleased to see the As-

Acta Theo-
log. Wirten.
p. 220.

mumble his Thistles, could not take much less Contentment to see how the Schoolmen handle this Testimony of Damascen. For, being very loth that so zealous an Assertor of Images, should in any thing seem opposite to the Church of Rome, they very handsomly, and with wonderful Subtilty bring him off, by admiring the Wisdom and Caution he useth, in these words. So your own St. Bonaventure, whose Testimony you think so considerable, as to produce at large, Tamen ipse cantè loquitur, unde non dicit quod Spiritus non est à filio, sed dicit non dicimus à filio, which you put in great Letters, the more to be taken notice of. But, I pray, What was it which Damascen was there delivering of? Was it not the Sense of the Greek Church concerning the Persons of the Trinity? And how could he otherwise have expressed it, than by non dicimus; but if this must argue what Bonaventure and you would have from it (for this is the only Testimony you give of your Distinction of Ancient and Modern Greeks) will it not as well hold for the other things before-mentioned

Sum. 1. q.
36. art. 2.
Vasquez in
Thom. To.
2. dif. 146.
c. 7. Petav-
ius dogm.
Theol. To.
2. l. 7. c.
17.

concerning the Father and the Son, where he useth dicimus & non dicimus, as well as here? And therefore Aquinas was much wiser, who plainly condemns Damascen for a Nestorian in this, licet à quibusdam dicatur, &c. although it be said by some, that in these words he neither affirms or denies it: Wherein I am much mistaken, if he reflects not on Bonaventure. Vasquez, Petavius, and several others think to bring Damascen off by the distinctions of à filio, and per filium, much to your purpose: But in the great Dispute at the Council at Florence, between Bessarion and Marcus Ephesius, about the Importance of the Particles ἐκ and διὰ, Marcus Ephesius

ἐκ ὡς ἐξ αὐτοῦ ἀλλ' ὡς δι' αὐτοῦ ἐκ πα-
τρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον. Hist. Concil.
Florent. sect. 8. c. 15. p. 239.

produceth the words of Damascen expressly, that the Spirit doth not proceed from the Son, but by the Son, whereby it is plain, that he understood per filium, in opposition to à filio. And Bessarion had nothing else to return in Answer to it, but that he could produce but one out of Antiquity, who said so. Thus we see, if Theophylact and Damascen,

sen, as well as *Theodoret* and *Photius*, be *Ancient Greeks*; your distinction comes to nothing. But besides this, it appears by the Disputations of *Hugo Etherianus* against the *Greeks*, who lived, saith *Bellarmin*, A. D. 1160. still extant in the *Bibliotheca Patrum*, that the *Greeks* held the very same then that they do now. And so in the *Synod of Bar in Apulia*, when *Anselm* disputed so stoutly against the *Greeks*, that *Pope Urban* said, he was, *alterius orbis Papa*, as the Story is related by *Eadmerus* and *Wilhelmus Malmesburienfis*; it appears, they denied the *Procession of the Spirit absolutely from the Son*; (and this was, A. D. 1096.) as is evident from the Letter of *Hildebertus* to him about the publishing his Disputation, and from the Book of *Anselm* still extant on that Subject. We find not therefore any ground for this Distinction of yours concerning the *Ancient and Modern Greeks*; and therefore they who said, that there was no real difference in any Matter of Faith between the *Ancient Greeks and Latins*, must be understood as well of the *Modern Greeks*, as them: Their words being no more capable of such a tolerable Interpretation as you speak of, than the words of any of the *Modern Greeks* are.

*Eadmer. de
vita An-
selm. l. 2.
Malmesbu.
de gestis
Pontif.
Angl. l. 1.*

His Lordship was proving, that the Point was not Fundamental, that the *Greeks and Latins* differed in, from that acknowledgment of *Peter Lombard*, and the *Schoolmen*; that is to say, *The Holy Ghost is the Spirit of the Father and the Son, and that he is, or proceeds from the Father and the Son, is not to speak different things, but the same sense in different words.* Now in this cause, saith he, where the words differ, but the sentence of Faith is the same (*penitus eadem*) even altogether the same, can the Point be Fundamental? But, say you, he was to prove, that such as were in grievous Error in Divinity, erred not fundamentally; and for proof of this, he alledges such as have no real Errour at all in Divinity. But do you not herein wilfully mistake his Lordship's Meaning? For in the Paragraph foregoing, his Lordship first declares his own Judgment concerning the denying the Procession of the Holy Ghost viz. That he did acknowledge it to be a grievous Error in Divinity: But yet he could not judge the *Greeks* guilty of a fundamental Errour, which he proves by a double Medium. 1. Because they did not thereby deny the Equality and Consubstantiality of the Persons. 2. Because divers learned Men were of opinion, [that à filio, & per filium] in the sense of the Greek Church, was but a Question in modo loquendi, and therefore not fundamental; now for this he produceth those Testimonies. Now, I pray, do you put no difference between the making a denial of a Proposition to be an Errour, and the saying, that such Persons are guilty of the denial of that Proposition? His Lordship grants the denial of the Procession to be a grievous Error in Divinity, but he questioned (as the *Greeks* expressed themselves, for those very words he inserts) whether they were guilty of denying that Proposition, as appears by the Authorities of the *Schoolmen*, and therefore certainly much less guilty of a fundamental Errour. Thus you see his Lordship fully proves what he intends; for if they agreed in Sense, they were much less guilty of a fundamental Errour, than if they had plainly denied the Procession, which he supposeth from those Authorities that they did not. And therefore when you sarcastically ask, *Is not this strong Logick?* The only answer I shall give you, is, That if you apprehend it not to be so, it is because of the weakness of your Theological Reason. And therefore you put his Lordship's Defender on a strange Task, to prove from those Authorities, that those *Greeks* who err grievously in Divinity, err not fundamentally. When the only Design of his Lordship, in producing those Authorities, was to shew, that according to their opinion, the *Greeks* were so far from erring fundamen-

S. 16.

P. 25.

P. 8.

and comprehensively sets down the Opinion of the Greek Church:

Πίστευε οὐ τὸ πνεῦμα ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς μόνον
προϊέναι, δι' οὗ καὶ χορηγεῖσθαι τῇ κτί-
σει· καὶ ὅτι ἐστὶν οὐ καὶ τῶν ὁμοδοξίας.
Id. ib.

*Believe thou that the Spirit doth proceed from the Fa-
ther, but is given to Men by the Son; and let this be
the Rule of sound Doctrine to thee. And what now
do the Modern Greeks say more than Theophylact
did? Or what do they say less; for they acknow-
ledge, that the Spirit is the Spirit of the Son as well*

as he? To the same purpose *Damascen*, who lived between the 6th and 7th Synod, about A. D. 730. in the time of *Leo Isaurus*, delivers the sense of the Greek Church in his time concerning this Article. *It must be consi-*

κρῆ γινώσκειν, ὅτι ὁ πατήρ ἐστι λέγοντος
ἐκ πνός, λέγοντος δὲ αὐτὸν ὅτι οὗτος πα-
τήρ· ὁ δὲ υἱὸν ἐστι λέγοντος αἰνον, ἐστὶ
πατήρ· λέγοντος δὲ αὐτὸν καὶ ἐκ τοῦ
πατρὸς, καὶ υἱὸν τοῦ πατρὸς· τὸ δὲ
πνεῦμα τὸ ἄγιον, καὶ ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς
λέγοντος, καὶ πνεῦμα πατρὸς ὀνομάζοντος,
ἐκ τοῦ οὗτος δὲ τὸ πνεῦμα ἐστι λέγοντος
πνεῦμα δὲ οὗτος ὀνομάζοντος.—καὶ δι'
οὗτος πεφανερῶνται καὶ μεταδίδονται ἡμῖν
ὁμολογούμεν. Joh. Damascenus de
Trinit. c. 8. & l. i. de Ortho-
doxa fide c. 11.

*dered, saith he, That we assert not the Father to be
from any, but that he is said to be the Father of the
Son. We say not, that the Son is a proper Cause,
neither the Father; but we say, the Son is from
the Father, and of the Father. The Holy Spi-
rit, we say, is from the Father, and of the Father;
but we say not, the Spirit is from the Son, but we call
him the Spirit of the Son; And we confess, that by
the Son, the Spirit is manifested and given to us.
These words are so plain, that the Patriarch Hie-
remias producing them, saith, Nothing can be more
clear and evident than these words are. But the Phi-
losopher, who was so much pleased to see the *Ass**

*Assa Theo-
log. Wirten.
p. 220.*

mumble his Thistles, could not take much less Contentment to see how the
Schoolmen handle this Testimony of *Damascen*. For, being very loth
that so zealous an Assertor of *Images*, should in any thing seem opposite
to the Church of Rome, they very handsomly, and with wonderful Sub-
tilty bring him off, by admiring the Wisdom and Caution he useth, in
these words. So your own *St. Bonaventure*, whose Testimony you think
so considerable, as to produce at large, *Tamen ipse cantè loquitur, unde
non dicit quod Spiritus non est à filio, sed dicit non dicimus à filio*, which
you put in great Letters, the more to be taken notice of. But, I pray,
What was it which *Damascen* was there delivering of? Was it not the
Sense of the Greek Church concerning the Persons of the Trinity? And
how could he otherwise have expressed it, than by *non dicimus*; but if
this must argue what *Bonaventure* and you would have from it (for this is
the only Testimony you give of your Distinction of *Ancient* and *Modern
Greeks*) will it not as well hold for the other things before-mentioned

*Sum. 1. q. concerning the Father and the Son, where he useth dicimus & non dicimus,
36. art. 2. as well as here? And therefore Aquinas was much wiser, who plainly
Vasquez in Thom. To. condemns Damascen for a Nestorian in this, licet à quibusdam dicatur, &c.
2. dis. 146. although it be said by some, that in these words he neither affirms or de-
c. 7. Petav-
vius dogm. nies it: Wherein I am much mistaken, if he reflects not on Bonaventure.
Theol. To. Vasquez, Petavius, and several others think to bring Damascen off by the
2. l. 7. c. distinctions of à filio, and per filium, much to your purpose: But in the
17. great Dispute at the Council at Florence, between Bessarion and Marcus E-*

ἐκ οὗ ἐξ αὐτοῦ ἀλλ' ὡς δὲ αὐτὸς ἐκ πα-
τρὸς ἐκπορεύμενον. Hist. Concil.
Florent. sect. 8. c. 15. p. 239.

phesius, about the Importance of the Particles *ἐξ* and *ἐκ*, *Marcus Ephesius*
produceth the words of *Damascen* expressly, that
the Spirit doth not proceed from the Son, but by the
Son, whereby it is plain, that he understood *per
filium*, in opposition to *à filio*. And *Bessarion* had
nothing else to return in Answer to it, but that he could produce but
one out of *Antiquity*, who said so. Thus we see, if *Theophylact* and *Dama-*
scen,

sen, as well as Theodoret and Photius, be *Ancient Greeks*; your distinction comes to nothing. But besides this, it appears by the Disputations of *Hugo Etherianus* against the *Greeks*, who lived, saith *Bellarmin*, A. D. 1160. still extant in the *Bibliotheca Patrum*, that the *Greeks* held the very same then that they do now. And so in the *Synod of Bar in Apulia*, when *Anselm* disputed so stoutly against the *Greeks*, that *Pope Urban* said, he was, *alterius orbis Papa*, as the Story is related by *Eadmerus* and *Wilhelmus Malmesburienfis*; it appears, they denied the *Procession of the Spirit absolutely from the Son*; (and this was, A. D. 1096.) as is evident from the Letter of *Hildebertus* to him about the publishing his Disputation, and from the Book of *Anselm* still extant on that Subject. We find not therefore any ground for this Distinction of yours concerning the *Ancient and Modern Greeks*; and therefore they who said, that there was no real difference in any Matter of Faith between the *Ancient Greeks and Latins*, must be understood as well of the *Modern Greeks*, as them: Their words being no more capable of such a tolerable Interpretation as you speak of, than the words of any of the *Modern Greeks* are.

*Eadmer. de
vita An-
selm. l. 2.
Malmesbu.
de gestis
Pontif.
Angl. l. 1.*

His Lordship was proving, that the Point was not Fundamental, that the *Greeks and Latins* differed in, from that acknowledgment of *Peter Lombard*, and the *Schoolmen*; that is to say, *The Holy Ghost is the Spirit of the Father and the Son, and that he is, or proceeds from the Father and the Son, is not to speak different things, but the same sense in different words. Now in this cause, saith he, where the words differ, but the sentence of Faith is the same (penitus eadem) even altogether the same, can the Point be Fundamental?* But, say you, he was to prove, that such as were in grievous Error in Divinity, erred not fundamentally; and for proof of this, he alledges such as have no real Error at all in Divinity. But do you not herein wilfully mistake his Lordship's Meaning? For in the Paragraph foregoing, his Lordship first declares his own Judgment concerning the denying the *Procession of the Holy Ghost viz. That he did acknowledge it to be a grievous Error in Divinity*: But yet he could not judge the *Greeks* guilty of a fundamental Error, which he proves by a double Medium. 1. *Because they did not thereby deny the Equality and Consubstantiality of the Persons.* 2. *Because divers learned Men were of opinion, [that à filio, & per filium] in the sense of the Greek Church, was but a Question in modo loquendi, and therefore not fundamental*; now for this he produceth those Testimonies. Now, I pray, do you put no difference between the making a denial of a Proposition to be an Error, and the saying, that such Persons are guilty of the denial of that Proposition? His Lordship grants the denial of the *Procession* to be a grievous Error in Divinity, but he questioned (as the *Greeks* expressed themselves, for those very words he inserts) whether they were guilty of denying that Proposition, as appears by the Authorities of the *Schoolmen*, and therefore certainly much less guilty of a fundamental Error. Thus you see his Lordship fully proves what he intends; for if they agreed in Sense, they were much less guilty of a fundamental Error, than if they had plainly denied the *Procession*, which he supposeth from those Authorities that they did not. And therefore when you sarcastically ask, *Is not this strong Logick?* The only answer I shall give you, is, That if you apprehend it not to be so, it is because of the weakness of your Theological Reason. And therefore you put his Lordship's Defender on a strange Task, to prove from those Authorities, that those *Greeks* who err grievously in Divinity, err not fundamentally. When the only Design of his Lordship, in producing those Authorities, was to shew, that according to their opinion, the *Greeks* were so far from erring fundamen-

S. 16.

P. 25.

P. 81.

Sentent. 1.
dist. 11.

In sent. 1.
i. dist. 11.
art. 1. q. 1.

damentally, that they did not err grievously in Divinity. And to this purpose the Citation of *Peter Lombard* was pertinent, who saith, *That because the Greeks acknowledge, that the Holy Ghost is the Spirit of the Son, though he doth not proceed from him; therefore the difference between the Greeks and the Latins, is in Words, and not in Sense; but, you say, He speaks only of such as differed in Words, and not in Substance; as though he put a difference between the Greeks, that some differed in words, and others really, which is quite beside his meaning: For he takes not the least notice of any such Difference among themselves; but saith, The Difference it self concerning the Procession, the Greeks acknowledging the Holy Ghost to be the Spirit of the Son, is more verbal than real. And that the present Greeks say full as much, is evident; for they acknowledge the same things in express words. The Testimony of Bonaventure hath been already considered, as far as concerns Damascen; as for the rest, it was sufficient for his Lordship's purpose, to produce such a Confession from so bitter an Enemy of the Greeks, as Bonaventure was (so his Lordship in his Marginal Citation says truly of him, licet Græcis insensissimus, &c.) That he doth not deny, but that Salvation might be had without the Article of Filioque; but whether on that supposition there were sufficient reason to add it to the Creed, will be considered afterwards. Though Bonaventure held the Greeks to be Hereticks and Schismaticks, I hope you do not think, that is Argument enough to perswade us that they were so. That any thing, without which Salvation might have been had before, may, by the definition of your Church, become so necessary, that Men cannot be saved without the belief of it, had need be more than barely asserted either by Bonaventure, or you; and we must wait for the proof of it, for any thing here said by either of you. That the Greeks might be excused by Ignorance, before such Declaration of your Church concerning the Filioque, and not be excused after through greater Ignorance of any such Power in your Church, to declare such things to be Matters of Faith, is an assertion not easie to be swallowed by such as have any strength of Logick, or one Drachm of Theological Reason: Or else it is a very strange thing, you should think it sufficient for the Greeks to know, what your Church had declared without an antecedent Knowledge that your Church had power to declare. How much you answer at random, appears by your answering Aquinas his Testimony, instead of that of Iodocus Clitovenus, as is plain enough in his Lordship's Margin; and you might have been easily satisfied that it was so, if you had taken the pains to look into either of them. But the Art of it was, Aquinas his Testimony might be easily answered, because he speaks only by hear-say, concerning the Opinion of some certain Greeks; but Clitovenus his was close to the purpose, who plainly confesseth, that the difference of the Ancient Greeks was more in words, and the manner of explaining the Procession than in the thing it self. This therefore you thought fit to slide by, and answer Aquinas for him. Your answer to Scotus depends on the former distinction of Ancient and Modern Greeks, and therefore falls with it. Bellarmine's answer concerning Damascen, and your own after Bonaventure of his non dicimus, hath been sufficiently disproved already. What Tolet holds, or the Lutherans deny, the words of neither being of either side produced, deserve no further Consideration.*

You tell us, his Lordship's Argument depends upon this, *That the Holy Ghost may be equal and consubstantial with the Son, though it proceed not from him; which, you say, is a matter too deep for his Lordship to wade into.* But any indifferent Reader would think it had been your Concernment to have shewn the contrary, that thereby you might seem to make good so heavy a Charge,

s. 17.
Ibid.

as that of *Hereſie* againſt the whole *Greek Church*. For, if the *Holy Ghoſt* cannot be equal and conſubſtantial with the *Father*, if it proceed not from the *Son*; then it follows, that they who deny the *Proceſſion*, muſt deny that *Equality* and *Conſubſtantiality* of the *Spirit* with the *Son*. Which you ought to prove to make good your Charge of *Hereſie*: But on the other ſide, if the *Spirit* may be proved to be God by ſuch Arguments, as do not at all infer his *Proceſſion* from the *Son*; then his *Equality* and *Conſubſtantiality* doth not depend upon that *Proceſſion*: For I ſuppoſe you grant, that it is the *Unity of Eſſence* in the *Persons* which make them equal and conſubſtantial; but we may ſufficiently prove the *Spirit* to be God by ſuch Arguments as do not infer the *Proceſſion* from the *Son*; as I might eaſily ſhew, if it appear by all the Arguments inſiſted on to that purpoſe: But I ſhall mention that which the ſecond *General Council* thought moſt conſequent to that purpoſe, which is the *Spirit's Eternal Proceſſion from the Father*; ſo that it proves the *Spirit* to be God, then its *Equality* with the *Son* is proved without his *Proceſſion* from the *Son*; for I hope you will not ſay, that the proving his *Proceſſion* from the *Father*, doth imply *Proceſſion* from the *Son* too: Becauſe the *Proceſſion* cannot be ſuppoſed to be from the *Eſſence*, for then the *Spirit* would proceed from it ſelf; but from the *Hypoſtaſis*, and therefore one cannot imply the concurrence of the other. And ſince you pretend ſo much to underſtand theſe depths, becauſe you renew a Charge of *Hereſie* againſt the *Greek Church* in this Particular, make uſe of your *Theological Reason* in giving an intelligible Answer to theſe Questions: 1. Why the *Spirit* may not be equal and conſubſtantial to the other *Persons* in the *Trinity*, ſuppoſing his *Proceſſion* to be only from the *Father*, as the *Son* to be Equal and Conſubſtantial with them, when his *Generation* is only from the *Father*. 2. If the *Proceſſion* from the *Son* be neceſſary to make the *Spirit* Conſubſtantial with the *Son*, why is not *Generation* of the *Son* by the *Spirit* neceſſary to make the *Son* conſubſtantial with the *Spirit*? 3. If the *Spirit* doth proceed from *Father* and *Son* as diſtinct *Hypoſtaſes*, how can he proceed from theſe *Hypoſtaſes* as one Principle by one common *Spiration*, without confounding their *Perſonalities*? Or elſe, ſhew how two diſtinct *Hypoſtaſes* always remaining ſo, can concur in the ſame numerical Action *ad intra*? 4. If there be ſuch a neceſſity of believing this as an Article of Faith, why hath not God thought fit to reveal to us, the diſtinct *Emanations* of the *Son* and *Spirit*; and wherein the *Eternal Generation* of the *Son* may be conceived as diſtinct from the *Proceſſion* of the *Spirit*, when both equally agree in the ſame *Eſſence*, and neither of them expreſs the *Perſonality* of the *Father*? Either, I ſay, undertake intelligibly to reſolve theſe things, or elſe ſuſtain your Charge of *Hereſie* againſt the *Greek Church*, and upbraid not his Lordſhip for not entering into theſe Depths. Methinks, there being confeſſed to be Depths on both ſides, might teach you a little more Moderaty in handling them, and much more Charity to Men who differ about them. For you may ſee, the *Greeks* want not great plauſiblenes of Reason on their ſide, as well as Authority of Scripture and Fathers, plain for them, but not ſo againſt them. As long therefore as the *Greek Church* confeſſeth the *Divinity*, *Conſubſtantiality*, *Eternal Proceſſion* of the *Spirit*; and acknowledgeth it to be the *Spirit* of the *Son*, there muſt be ſomething more in it than the bare denial of the *Proceſſion* from the *Son*, which muſt make you ſo eaſy in your Charge of *Hereſie* againſt her. The truth is, there is ſomething elſe in the matter, by this Article of *Filioque*, the Authority of the *Church of Rome* in matters of Faith is ſtruck at: And therefore, if this be an *Hereſie*, it muſt be on the account

damentally, that *they did not err grievously in Divinity*. And to this purpose the Citation of *Peter Lombard* was pertinent, *who saith, That because the Greeks acknowledge, that the Holy Ghost is the Spirit of the Son, though he doth not proceed from him; therefore the difference between the Greeks and the Latins, is in Words, and not in Sense; but, you say, He speaks only of such as differed in Words, and not in Substance; as though he put a difference between the Greeks, that some differed in words, and others really, which is quite beside his meaning: For he takes not the least notice of any such Difference among themselves; but saith, The Difference it self concerning the Procession, the Greeks acknowledging the Holy Ghost to be the Spirit of the Son, is more verbal than real. And that the present Greeks say full as much, is evident; for they acknowledge the same things in express words. The Testimony of Bonaventure hath been already considered, as far as concerns Damascen; as for the rest, it was sufficient for his Lordship's purpose, to produce such a Confession from so bitter an Enemy of the Greeks, as Bonaventure was (so his Lordship in his Marginal Citation says truly of him, licet Græcis insensissimus, &c.) That he doth not deny, but that Salvation might be had without the Article of Filioque; but whether on that supposition there were sufficient reason to add it to the Creed, will be considered afterwards. Though Bonaventure held the Greeks to be Hereticks and Schismaticks, I hope you do not think, that is Argument enough to perswade us that they were so. That any thing, without which Salvation might have been had before, may, by the definition of your Church, become so necessary, that Men cannot be saved without the belief of it, had need be more than barely asserted either by Bonaventure, or you; and we must wait for the proof of it, for any thing here said by either of you. That the Greeks might be excused by Ignorance, before such Declaration of your Church concerning the Filioque, and not be excused after through greater Ignorance of any such Power in your Church, to declare such things to be Matters of Faith, is an assertion not easie to be swallowed by such as have any strength of Logick, or one Drachm of Theological Reason: Or else it is a very strange thing, you should think it sufficient for the Greeks to know, what your Church had declared without an antecedent Knowledge that your Church had power to declare. How much you answer at random, appears by your answering Aquinas his Testimony, instead of that of Jodocus Clichtoveus, as is plain enough in his Lordship's Margin; and you might have been easily satisfied that it was so, if you had taken the pains to look into either of them. But the Art of it was, Aquinas his Testimony might be easily answered, because he speaks only by hear-say, concerning the Opinion of some certain Greeks; but Clichtoveus his was close to the purpose, who plainly confesseth, that the difference of the Ancient Greeks was more in words, and the manner of explaining the Procession than in the thing it self. This therefore you thought fit to slide by, and answer Aquinas for him. Your answer to Scotus depends on the former distinction of Ancient and Modern Greeks, and therefore falls with it. Bellarmine's answer concerning Damascen, and your own after Bonaventure of his non dicimus, hath been sufficiently disproved already. What Tolet holds, or the Lutherans deny, the words of neither being of either side produced, deserve no further Consideration.*

s. 17.
 Ibid.

You tell us, his Lordship's Argument depends upon this, *That the Holy Ghost may be equal and consubstantial with the Son, though it proceed not from him; which, you say, is a matter too deep for his Lordship to wade into.* But any indifferent Reader would think it had been your Concernment to have shewn the contrary, that thereby you might seem to make good so heavy a Charge,

as that of *Herese* against the whole *Greek Church*. For, if the *Holy Ghost* cannot be equal and consubstantial with the *Son*, if it proceeds not from the *Son*; then it follows, that they who deny this Procession, must deny that Equality and Consubstantiality of the *Spirit* with the *Son*. Which you ought to prove, to make good your Charge of *Herese*: But on the other side, if the *Spirit* may be proved to be *God* by such Arguments as do not at all infer his Procession from the *Son*, then his Equality and Consubstantiality doth not depend upon that Procession: For I suppose you grant, that it is the *Unity of Essence* in the Persons which make them equal and consubstantial; but we may sufficiently prove the *Spirit* to be *God* by such Arguments as do not infer the Procession from the *Son*; as I might easily make appear by all the Arguments insisted on to that purpose: But I only mention that which the second *General Council* thought most cogent to that purpose, which is the *Spirit's Eternal Procession from the Father*; if that proves the *Spirit* to be *God*, then its Equality with the *Son*, is proved without his Procession from the *Son*; for I hope you will not say, that the proving his Procession from the *Father*, doth imply Procession from the *Son* too: Because the Procession cannot be supposed to be from the *Essence*, for then the *Spirit* would proceed from it self, but from the *Hypostasis*, and therefore one cannot imply the concurrence of the other. And since you pretend so much to understand these depths; before you renew a Charge of *Herese* against the *Greek Church* in this Particular, make use of your *Theological Reason* in giving an intelligible Answer to these Questions: 1. Why the *Spirit* may not be equal and consubstantial to the other Persons in the *Trinity*, supposing his Procession to be only from the *Father*, as the *Son* to be Equal and Consubstantial with them, when his Generation is only from the *Father*. 2. If the Procession from the *Son* be necessary to make the *Spirit* Consubstantial with the *Son*, why is not Generation of the *Son* by the *Spirit* necessary to make the *Son* consubstantial with the *Spirit*? 3. If the *Spirit* doth proceed from *Father* and *Son* as distinct *Hypostases*, how can he proceed from these *Hypostases* as one Principle by one common Spiration, without confounding their *Personalities*? Or else, shew how two distinct *Hypostases* always remaining so, can concur in the same numerical Action *ad intra*? 4. If there be such a necessity of believing this as an Article of Faith, why hath not *God* thought fit to reveal to us, the distinct *Emanations* of the *Son* and *Spirit*; and wherein the *Eternal Generation* of the *Son* may be conceived as distinct from the *Procession* of the *Spirit*, when both equally agree in the same *Essence*, and neither of them express the *Personality* of the *Father*? Either, I say, undertake intelligibly to resolve these things, or else surcease your Charge of *Herese* against the *Greek Church*, and upbraid not his Lordship for not entering into these Depths. Methinks, there being confessed to be Depths on both sides, might teach you a little more Modesty in handling them, and much more Charity to Men who differ about them. For you may see, the *Greeks* want not great plausibleness of Reason on their side, as well as Authority of *Scripture* and *Fathers*, plain for them, but not so against them. As long therefore as the *Greek Church* confesseth the *Divinity*, *Consubstantiality*, *Eternal Procession* of the *Spirit*; and acknowledgeth it to be the *Spirit* of the *Son*, there must be something more in it than the bare denial of the Procession from the *Son*, which must make you so eager in your Charge of *Herese* against her. The truth is, there is something else in the matter; by this Article of *Filioque*, the Authority of the *Church* of *Rome* in Matters of Faith is struck at: And therefore, if this be an *Herese*, it must be on the account

of denying the Plenitude of her Power in Matters of Faith, as *Anselm* and *Bonaventure* ingenuously confess it; and plead it on that account. And therefore wise Men are not apt to Believe, but that if the Church of Rome had not been particularly concerned in this Addition to the Creed; if the Greeks would have submitted in all other things to the Church of Rome, this Charge of Heresie would soon be taken off the File. But, as things stand, if she be not found guilty of Heresie, she may be found as *Catholick* as Rome, and more too, and therefore there is a necessity for it, she must be contented to bear it, for it is not consistent with the Interest of the Church of Rome, that she should be free from Heresie, Schism, &c. But if she hath no stronger Adversaries to make good the Charge than you, she may satisfy her self, that though the Blows be rude, yet they are given her by feeble Hands. For let us now make way for Theological Reason to enter the Lists armed Cap-a-pe in Mood and Figure. For now at last you tell

P. 11. us, *You will argue in Form against his Lordship and the Greek Church together.* And thus it proceeds, *If the Greeks Error be not only concerning, but against the Holy Ghost, then (according to the Bishop's own distinction) they have lost all Assistance of that Blessed Spirit, and are become no true Church; But their Error is not only concerning, but against the Holy Ghost: Therefore, &c.* The Major, or first Proposition contains the Bishop's own Doctrine, the Minor, or second Proposition (wherein you learnedly tell us, what the Major and Minor in Syllogisms are) you thus prove. All Errors, specially opposite to the particular and personal Procession of the Holy Ghost, are (according to all Divines) not only Errors concerning, but Errors against the Holy Ghost: But the Greeks Error is opposite to the particular and personal Procession of the Holy Ghost, as is already proved: Ergo, their Error is not only concerning, but against the Holy Ghost; whose Assistance therefore they have lost, not only according to the first, but even latter Branch of the Bishop's Distinction: And consequently remain no true Church. Now, who is there, that out of meer pity can find in his heart not to yield this to you, when you have been at such pains to prove it? But things set out with the greatest Formality, have not always the most Solidity in them. All the Force of this Argument, such as it is, lies in this, that his Lordship had said, *That the Error of the Greeks was rather about the Doctrine concerning the Holy Ghost, than against the Holy Ghost*, which he after explains, by saying, *It was not such an Error, as did destroy the Equality or Consubstantiality of the Spirit with the other Persons of the Trinity; I pray now take his Lordship's Explication of himself, and you must form your Argument after another way than you have done: But you saw well enough, that you could not make any shew of an Argument but meerly from words.* If I thought it worth considering, it were easie to tell you, that what is only against the Procession from the Son, is not thereby against the Holy Ghost, because it may be the Holy Ghost, i. e. the third Person in the Trinity, though it proceed only from the Father. And as well you might say, that whatever Doctrine denies the Son to be begotten of the Spirit, is not only concerning, but against the Son, and urge the Consequences upon as good Terms as you do about the Spirit: But so trifling an Argument is too much honoured by any serious Confutation. And, it seems, you were something sensible of it your self, when you say, *His Lordship seemed to have provided against the Force of it (as who would not?) by hinting a difference between Errors Fundamental and not Fundamental; which Point I shall purposely examine in the following Chapter.* When you therefore come to hold forth what is now but hinted at, I shall readily hearken to what you have to say.

Thus

Thus for any thing you have produced to the contrary, it sufficiently appears, that the *Greek Church* is very unjustly charged with *Hereſie* by you, and that thoſe *Testimonies* which his Lordſhip produced, would as well hold for the *Modern* as *Ancient Greeks*: To which I might add the judgment of *others* of your own ſide, who ſpeak as much concerning the *Modern Greeks*, as *Thomas à Jeſu*, *Azorius* and others; but I think not that way of arguing to have much force on either ſide, and therefore paſs it over.

And come to the Debate of the *Filioque*, with which, you ſay, his Lordſhip begins to quibble, on occaſion of the Pope's inserting it into the Creed. But I am quite of another mind, I think he ſpeaks very ſeriously, and with a great deal of Reason, when he ſaith, *And Rome in this particular ſhould be more moderate, if it be but becauſe this Article (Filioque) was added to the Creed by her ſelf. And 'tis hard to add and Anathematize too.* For what you ſay to this, of the *Holy Ghoſt's* having leave to aſſiſt the Church, in adding expreſſions for the better explication of any Article of Faith: And then the Pope hath leave and command too, to Anathematize all ſuch, as ſhall not allow the uſe of ſuch expreſſions: I commend you, that when you muſt beg ſomething, you would beg all that was to be had at once; but, before you perſwade us to the digeſting ſuch Crudities as theſe are, prove but theſe following things, 1. Where it is, that there is any promiſe of the *Holy Ghoſt's* aſſiſtance, in adding any Articles to the Creed, under pretence of better expreſſions for explication of them? 2. Suppoſing ſuch an Aſſiſtance, what ground is there to impoſe ſuch additional *Expreſſions*, ſo that thoſe who admit them not, muſt be guilty of *Hereſie*, and conſequently (by your Principles) incur *Eternal Damnation*. 3. How thoſe *Expreſſions* can be accounted a better *Explication* of an Article of Faith, which contain ſomething not implied in, nor neceſſarily deduced from, any other Article of Faith? 4. If this *Aſſiſtance* be promiſed to the Church, how any one part of that Church, as great a part ſtill oppoſing ſuch additional *Expreſſions*, can claim that Aſſiſtance to it ſelf; the other parts of the *Catholick Church*, utterly denying it? 5. If an aſſiſtance as to ſuch things be promiſed the Church, why may it not be more reaſonably preſumed to be in an *Oecumenical Council*, as that at *Ephesus* forbidding ſuch Additions, than in any part of the Church, which after ſuch a Decree ſhall directly contradict it? 6. What Right can the Church have to Anathematize any for the not uſing ſuch *Expreſſions*, which that Church which determines the uſe of them, doth acknowledge to be only *Expreſſions* for better *Explication* of an Article of Faith? And conſequently the denial of them cannot amount to the denial of an Article of Faith; but only of the better *Explication* of it. 7. If all theſe things be granted, how comes the Pope, not only to have leave, but command too, to Anathematize all ſuch as uſe not theſe *Expreſſions*? Where is that Command extant? How comes it to be limited to him? Is he expreſſed in it? Or doth it by neceſſary Conſequence follow from it? What good would it do us, to ſee but one of theſe proved, which you very fairly beg in the lump together: And, till you have proved them all, you may aſſure your ſelf, that we ſhall never believe that the Pope hath ſo much as leave, much leſs command, to Add and Anathematize too.

As to the *Filioque*, you grant, That many hundred Years had paſſed from the time of the *Apoſtles*, before *Filioque* was added to the *Nicene Creed*, and more ſince the *Declarations* and *Decrees* were ſufficiently publiſhed, and in all theſe Years *Salvation* was had without mention of *Filioque*. A fair Conceſſion; and nothing is wanting to deſtroy all that you had ſaid before, but only this, that what was not once neceſſary to *Salvation*, cannot by any after-declara-

of denying the Plerumde of the Holy Ghost in Matters of Faith as Angels and Conventuals ingeniously contrive it, and plead it on that account. And therefore while Men are not apt to believe, but that if the Church of Rome had not been particularly concerned in this Addition to the Creed, if the Greeks would have submitted in all other things to the Church of Rome, this Charge of Heresie would soon be taken off the File. But, as things stand, if she be not found guilty of Heresie, she may be found as Catholick as Rome, and more so, and therefore there is a necessity for it, she must be contented to bear it, for it is not consistent with the Interest of the Church of Rome, that she should be free from Heresie, Schism, &c. But if she hath no stronger Adversaries to make good the Charge than you, she may satisfy her self, that though the Blow be rude, yet they are given her by feeble Hands. For let us now make way for Theological Reason to enter the Lists armed Cap-a-pe in Mood and Figure. For now at last you tell us, *You will argue in Form against his Lordship and the Greek Church together.* And thus it proceeds, *If the Greeks Errour be not only concerning, but against the Holy Ghost, then (according to the Bishop's own distinction) they have lost all Assistance of that Blessed Spirit, and are become no true Church; But their Errour is not only concerning, but against the Holy Ghost. Therefore, &c.* The Major, or first Proposition contains the Bishop's own Doctrine, the Minor, or second Proposition (wherein you learnedly tell us, what the Major and Minor in Syllogisms are) you thus prove. *All Errours, specially opposite to the particular and personal Procession of the Holy Ghost, are (according to all Divines) not only Errours concerning, but Errours against the Holy Ghost: But the Greeks Errour is opposite to the particular and personal Procession of the Holy Ghost, as is already proved. Ergo, their Errour is not only concerning, but against the Holy Ghost; whose Assistance therefore they have lost, not only according to the first, but even latter Branch of the Bishop's Distinction: And consequently remain no true Church.* Now, who is there, that out of meekness can find in his heart not to yield this to you, when you have been at such pains to prove it? But things set out with the greatest Formality, have not always the most Solidity in them. All the Force of this Argument, such as it is, lies in this, that his Lordship had said, *That the Errour of the Greeks was rather about the Doctrine concerning the Holy Ghost, than against the Holy Ghost, which he after explains, by saying, It was not such an Errour, as did destroy the Equality or Consubstantiality of the Spirit with the other Persons of the Trinity; I pray now take his Lordship's Explication of himself, and you must form your Argument after another way than you have done: But you saw well enough, that you could not make any new of an Argument but merely from words.* If I thought it worth considering, it were easie to tell you, that what is only against the Procession from the Son, is not thereby against the Holy Ghost, because it may be the Holy Ghost, i. e. the third Person in the Trinity, though it proceed only from the Father. And as well you might say, that whatever Doctrine denies the Son to be begotten of the Spirit, is not only concerning, but against the Son, and urge the Consequences upon as good Terms as you do about the Spirit: But so trifling an Argument is too much honoured by any serious Confutation. And, it seems, you were something sensible of it your self, when you say, *His Lordship seemed to have provided against the Force of it (as who would not?) by making a difference between Errours Fundamental and not Fundamental, which Point I shall purposely examine in the following Chapter.* When you therefore come to hold forth what is now but *bin-vectat*, I shall readily hearken to what you have to say.

Thus

Thus for any thing you have produced to the contrary, it sufficiently appears, that the *Greek Church* is very unjustly charged with *Herésie* by you, and that those Testimonies which his Lordship produced, would as well hold for the *Modern as Ancient Greeks*: To which I might add the judgment of *others* of your own side, who speak as much concerning the *Modern Greeks*, as *Thomas à Jesu, Azorius* and others; but I think not that way of arguing to have much force on either side, and therefore pass it over.

And come to the Debate of the *Filioque*, with which, you say, his Lordship begins to quibble, on occasion of the Pope's inserting it into the Creed. But I am quite of another mind, I think he speaks very seriously, and with a great deal of Reason, when he saith, *And Rome in this particular should be more moderate, if it be but because this Article (Filioque) was added to the Creed by her self. And 'tis hard to add and Anathematize too.* For what you say to this, of the *Holy Ghost's* having leave to assist the Church, in adding expressions for the better explication of any Article of Faith: And then the Pope hath leave and command too, to Anathematize all such, as shall not allow the use of such expressions: I commend you, that when you must beg something, you would beg all that was to be had at once; but, before you persuade us to the digesting such Crudities as these are, prove but these following things, 1. Where it is, that there is any promise of the *Holy Ghost's* assistance, in adding any Articles to the Creed, under pretence of better expressions for explication of them? 2. Supposing such an Assistance, what ground is there to impose such additional Expressions, so that those who admit them not, must be guilty of *Herésie*, and consequently (by your Principles) incur *Eternal Damnation*. 3. How those Expressions can be accounted a better Explication of an Article of Faith, which contain something not implied in, nor necessarily deduced from, any other Article of Faith? 4. If this Assistance be promised to the Church, how any one part of that Church, as great a part stillly opposing such additional Expressions, can claim that Assistance to it self; the other parts of the *Catholick Church*, utterly denying it? 5. If an assistance as to such things be promised the Church, why may it not be more reasonably presumed to be in an *Oecumenical Council*, as that at *Ephesus* forbidding such Additions, than in any part of the Church, which after such a Decree shall directly contradict it? 6. What Right can the Church have to Anathematize any for the not using such Expressions, which that Church which determines the use of them, doth acknowledge to be only Expressions for better Explication of an Article of Faith? And consequently the denial of them cannot amount to the denial of an Article of Faith; but only of the better Explication of it. 7. If all these things be granted, how comes the Pope, not only to have leave, but command too, to Anathematize all such as use not these Expressions? Where is that Command extant? How comes it to be limited to him? Is he expressed in it? Or doth it by necessary Consequence follow from it? What good would it do us, to see but one of these proved, which you very fairly beg in the lump together: And, till you have proved them all, you may assure your self, that we shall never believe that the Pope hath so much as leave, much less command, to Add and Anathematize too.

As to the *Filioque*, you grant, *That many hundred Years had passed from the time of the Apostles, before Filioque was added to the Nicene Creed, and more since the Declarations and Decrees were sufficiently published, and in all these Years Salvation was had without mention of Filioque.* A fair Concession; and nothing is wanting to destroy all that you had said before, but only this, that what was not once necessary to Salvation, cannot by any after-declara-

P. 11, 12. ration of the Church be made necessary, as shall be abundantly manifested in the *Controversie of Fundamentals*. What follows, must be more particularly considered, because therein you would fain remove the Article of *Filioque*, from being the cause of the *Schism* between the *Eastern* and *Western Churches*, and impute it wholly to the *Pride* and *Ambition* of the *Eastern Prelates*. Your words are, *But it is also true, That the Addition of Filioque to the Creed, was made many Years before the Difference brake out between the Latins and Greeks; so that the inserting this word (Filioque) into the Creed, was not the first occasion of Schism: But Grudges arising among the Greeks, who had been a large flourishing Church, with a number of most learned and zealous Prelates, and held the Articles still, though upon emptier Heads; such, quickly filled with Wind, thinking their swelling places, and great City of Constantinople, might hold up against Rome; they began to quarrel, not for Places (that was too mean a Motive for such as look'd so big) but first they would make it appear, they could teach Rome; nay, they spied out Heresies in it (the old way of all Hereticks) and so fell to question the Procession of the Ghost; and must needs have Filioque out of the Creed.* These words of yours lay the charge of *Schism* on the *Greeks* wholly, and therefore, in order to our vindication of them from that, two things must be enquired into. 1. Whether it was in your Churches Power to make the Addition of *Filioque* to the Creed. 2. Whether the *Greeks Ambition* and *Pride* were the only cause of the Separation between the *Eastern* and *Western Churches*.

1. Concerning the Addition of *Filioque*, two things must be enquired into; 1. When it began, and by whom it was added to the Creed. 2. Whether they who added it, had power so to do, and to impose on all others the use of it.

P. 164. 1. Concerning the time of this Addition, nothing seems more dark in Church History, than the precise and punctual time of it. And so much you acknowledge your self elsewhere. But it seems, it is your Concernment, to say, *That the Addition was made before the Difference brake out.* To that I answer, if you mean, that in some Churches the Procession from the Son was acknowledged before that Difference, I grant it, as is clear by some Councils of Toledo; and, that the Doctrine of the Procession was received in France too, about the time of Charles the Great, I acknowledge, and that it was admitted into the solemn Offices of the Church; but, that it was added to the *Nicene* and *Constantinopolitan Creed* to be received by all Churches; so that it should not be lawful for any to use that Creed without such Addition, that I deny to have been before the *Schism*, but assert it to have been a great occasion of it. It is acknowledged, that in Spain, several Councils of Toledo, in their profession of Faith, do mention the Procession from the Son; but this they delivered only as their own private Judgments, and not as the publick Creed received by all Churches. For, Petavius confesseth, that, in *Symbolo ipso nihil adjecerunt, they added nothing at all to the Creed.* And, although the custom of singing the *Constantinopolitan Creed* in the Liturgy, seems first to have begun in Spain, from whom Petavius supposeth, both the French and Germans received it; yet, even there it appears, it was not universally received. For, the Church of Sevil contented it self still with the *Mozarabick Liturgy*, in which only the bare *Nicene Creed* was used. You tell us indeed, *That the inserting the Article in the Councils of Toledo, is supposed to have been done upon the Authority of an Epistle they had received from Pope Leo: Which, though it be not barely supposed, but asserted with great Confidence by Baronius; yet, (as most other things in him which are brought to advance the*

Dogmat.
Theol. Tom.
2. l. 7. c. 2.

the Pope's Authority) it hath no other ground but his confident Assertion. There being not the least shadow of Proof for it, but only that this *Leo*, Baron. To. 5. An. 447. n. 58. in a certain Epistle of his to the Spaniards, did, *once upon a time*, mention, that the Son proceeded from the Father. Therefore, in Spain, I grant the Doctrine to be received; I deny the Addition to be made to the Constantinopolitan Creed: Although it be read, as added to it in the 8th or 10th Council of Toledo, under *Recceswinthus*, Anno Dom. 653. But this was still only the Declaration of their own Faith, in this Article, and no imposing it on others. In France, that it began to be received in publick use, A. D. 809. must be acknowledged by the Proceedings of the Legates from the Council of Aquisgrane to Pope Leo 3. But, it appears as clearly, that Pope Leo did then condemn the use of it, as will be shewed afterwards. When it should creep into the Athanasian Creed, seems as hard to find out, as when first added to the Constantinopolitan; but, if we believe *Pithæus*, the whole Creed was of a French Composition (there being many Arguments to persuade us, it never was made by *Athanasius*; of which, in their due place) and *Vossius* adds, That it is very probable it was Composed about the time of Charles the Great, the Controversie being then so rife about the Procession. But that seems the less probable, because the Article of Filioque is not found in the Ancient Copies of that Creed. For *Spalatensis* saith, That in all the Greek Copies he had seen, there was only mention made of the Procession from the Father. And the Patriarch *Cyril* saith, That not only the Symbol of *Athanasius* is adulterated among the Latins; but, that it is proved to be so by the more ancient and genuine Copies. But, however this be, we deny not but the Article of Procession from the Son, grew into use, especially in the Gallican and Spanish Churches, before the Schism broke out between the Eastern and Western Churches; but, our enquiry is not concerning that, but concerning the time when it was so added to the Constantinopolitan Creed, that it was required to be used only with that Addition. For this you tell us, That *Hugo Eterianus* affirms, that it was added by the Pope in a full Council at Rome, but he names not the Pope. So likewise the Latin Divines, at the Council of Florence, pretended still, that it was added by the Pope in a full Council, but very carefully forbear the mention of the Person, or the punctual time. But, it is your unhappiness, if there be divers Opinions to be followed, to make choice of the most improbable; as you do here, when you embrace that of *Socolovius*, which is, That the Fathers of the first Council at Constantinople, sending the Confession of their Faith to Pope *Damasus*, and his Council at Rome; the Pope and Council at Rome approved of their said Confession; but yet added, by way of Explication, the word Filioque to the Article which concerned the Holy Ghost; and this they did, to signifie, that the Holy Ghost as true God, proceeded from the Son, and was not made or created by him, as some Hereticks in those times began to teach. Neither doth he, say you, affirm this without Citation of some credible Authority. I could wish you had produced it, not only for our satisfaction, but of the more learned Men of your own side, who look on this as an improbable Fiction. *Bellarmino* produceth many Arguments against it, saying, That no mention is made of it in the Councils, or *Theodore's History*, who particularly relates the Letters of the Council to *Damasus*, and his to the Council; that *Leo 3.* caused the Constantinopolitan Creed to be inscribed in a Silver Table, without that Addition; that the third Council of Toledo used the Creed

Magni Athanasii symbolum, quamvis Treveris ut plerique tradiderunt, i. e. in Gallia à Theologo tamen inter illos doctissimo acutissimoque scriptum. P. Pithæus Opusc. de process. Sp. S. Vossius de tribus symbol. Addend. ad p. 55. 31. Spalatensis de Rep. Eccles. Tom. 3. l. 7. c. 10. sect. 124. Patriarch. Cyril. ep. ad Joh. Utenbogard. p. 404.

P. 16.

Bellarmino de Christo l. 2. c. 21. sect. ult.

without

without that Addition; that the *Greeks* did not begin this *Controversie* till A. D. 600. And how could they possibly charge the *Latins* with breaking the *Canons* of the *third Oecumenical*, when, (according to this Opinion) it was added in the *second*? *Petavius* is so great a Friend to your Opinion, that in plain terms he calls it *ridiculous*, and abundantly confutes that Imagination of its being inserted, because of the Heresie of the *Monothelists*, as *Manuel Calecas* calls it, who with *Aristinus*, are all those worshipful Authorities which this Opinion stands on. But, setting aside the contrary Authorities to these, any one, who is any thing versed in this *Controversie*, must needs esteem this the most improbable account that can be given of this Addition. For, if this were true, how little did the *Latins* at the Council at *Florence* understand their business; when, if they could have produced such an Addition before the *Ephefine Council*, all the *Greeks* Objections had come to nothing? If this were true, how little did *Leo 3.* consult his own, or his Predecessour's Honour, who dissuaded the *Legates* of the Council at *Aquisgrane*, from continuing in the *Creed* that Addition of *Filioque*: For, when after a great deal of discourse concerning the Article and the Addition; the *Legates* at last tell him, *That they perceived, his pleasure was, that it should be taken out of the Creed, and so every one left to his liberty.* His Answer is, *So it is certainly determined by me, and I would persuade you by all means to assent to it:*

Petav. Dogmat. Theol. de Trinit. Tom. 2. l. 7. c. 2.

Ita proculdubio à nostra parte decernitur; ita quoque, ut à vestra assentiatur. à nobis omnimodis suadetur. Apud Sirmond. Concil. Gallic. Tom. 2. p. 256.

Baron. Annal. ad An. 809.

Phot. in ep. ad Patriarch. Aquileiens. Pct. Lombard. lib. 1. sent. dist. 11.

Tunc inter alias accusationes hoc principaliter posuit, Ipsum fore excommunicatum, quod apposuerat ad symbolum, Sp. Sanctum à filio procedere. Similiter & depositum, quod ipse Nicolaus Papa incidisset in sententiam tertii Concilii, Anton. Part. 3. Tit. 22. c. 13. sect. 10.

Concil. Florent. sess. 8.

and *Petavius* seems not to dissent; the only thing which is pretended against it, is, that *Andreas Colossensis* in the Council at *Ferrara*, saith, That though *Photius* was a known and bitter Enemy of the *Latin Church*, yet he never objected this Addition against *Nicolans* or *Adrian*; but how strangely overseen *Andreas* was in these words, sufficiently appears by *Photius* his *Encyclical Epistle*, wherein he doth in Terms object this against the *Latins*, as appears by the words already produced. So that although you would willingly have set this Addition far enough off from the *Schism*, yet you see how improbable a Fiction you produce for it; and withal you see, that this Addition, by the consent of your own most Learned and Impartial Writers, falls just upon the time when the *Schism* broke out, viz. in the time of *Nicolaus* and *Photius*; and therefore, now judge you, whether these words were so long added before the *Schism*, that they could give no occasion to it.

2. The next thing to be considered; is, *Whether they who added to the Creed, had power so to do?* Two things the Greeks insist on to show, that it was not done by sufficient Authority. 1. *Because all such Additions were directly prohibited by the Ephesine Council.* 2. *That supposing them not prohibited, yet the Council had no power to add to the Creed without the consent of the Eastern Churches.*

1. *That such Additions were severely prohibited by the Ephesine Council.* The Sanction of which Council to this purpose hath been already produced, and is extant both in the *Acts* of the *Ephesine* and *Florentine Councils*, in which latter it is insisted on as the *Foundation* of the *Greek Arguments* against the Addition of *Filioque*, by *Marcus Ephesine*; and the Reason here there gives of such a Sanction made by the Council at *Ephesus*, is, that after the *Nicene Council*, in several Provincial Councils, there were above thirty several *Expositions* made of the *Nicene Creed*, upon which, the second *Oecumenical Council* made a further Explication of it, explaining those things which belonged to the *Divinity* of the *Spirit*, and the *Incarnation* of *Christ*; and because they did not prohibit any Additions, the *Nestorians* easily deformed the *Nicene Creed*, inserting their own Opinions into it (as appears by the Confession of Faith exhibited to the Council by *Ephesus*) which being read in the Council, and the *Fathers* thereby understanding how easily, after this rate, *New Creeds* might be continually made in the Church, they severely prohibited any further Additions to be made to the Creed. And therefore, although they Decreed in that Council the *Virgin Mary* to be *divine*, in opposition to *Nestorius*; yet, they never offered to insert it into the Creed, although they apprehended it necessary to explain the *Oeconomy* of our *Saviour's Incarnation*. And that which much confirms the meaning of the Decree, to be the absolute prohibition of all kind of Additions to the Creed, is, the *Epistle* of *St. Cyril of Alexandria* to *Johannes Antiochenus*, wherein reciting this Decree of the Council, he adds these words as the Explication of it. *We neither permit our selves, or others to change one Word or Syllable of what is herein contained* (speaking of the *Nicene Creed*) which *Epistle* was read and approved in the fourth *Oecumenical Council*. To this the *Latins* answered

ἡμεῖς οὐδὲν ἐντέλλομεθα ἑαυτοῖς, ἢ ἄλλοις
ἢ ἄλλῃ ἀποστολῇ ἢ συνάξει ὧν ἀνέστη,
ἢ ἰδὼν ἢ ἀκούσαντων ἀλλοτρίως.

them, that which is still answered in the same case, viz. *That this Article of Filioque was only a Declaration, and not a prohibited Addition*: But the *Greeks* say, this Answer is unsatisfactory on these accounts. 1. *Because there is no reason to say, that Decree doth not forbid the inserting Declarations into the Creed.* 2. *That if it did not forbid that, yet there is as little reason to say, this was a meer Declaration.* 1. *Because there is no reason to say, that the Council did not forbid the inserting Declarations into the Creed*: For, as *Bessarion* well observes, it never was lawful to add new and distinct Articles of Faith, from those which are contained in Scripture, but the Church only undertook the Explication and Declaration of the things therein contained; and this was only lawful. Therefore the *Ancient Fathers* had full liberty of explaining Articles of Faith, and using those Explications, as they judged most expedient, and to place them where they thought good, so it were not in Scripture. Thence they might insert them into the Creed, or elsewhere. But afterwards (i.e. after the Decree of the *Ephesine Council*) this liberty was partly taken away, and partly continued. For it never was, or will be, unlawful to explain or declare Articles of Faith; but to insert those Explications into the Creed, is now unlawful, because forbidden by the Decree of a *General Council*. For, saith he, the *Fathers* of the third Council, observing what great Inconveniencies had

Council
Florent. sess.
8. p. 626.

without that Addition ; that the *Greeks* did not begin this *Controversie* till A. D. 600. And how could they possibly charge the *Latins* with breaking the *Canons* of the *third Oecumenical*, when, (according to this Opinion) it was added in the *second* ? *Petavius* is so great a Friend to your Opinion, that in plain terms he calls it *ridiculous*, and abundantly confutes that Imagination of its being inserted, because of the Heresie of the *ὁμοιότης*, as *Manuel Calecas* calls it, who with *Aristinus*, are all those worshipful Authorities which this Opinion stands on. But, setting aside the contrary Authorities to these, any one, who is any thing versed in this Controversie, must needs esteem this the most improbable account that can be given of this Addition. For, if this were true, how little did the *Latins* at the Council at *Florence* understand their business ; when, if they could have produced such an Addition before the *Ephesine Council*, all the *Greeks* Objections had come to nothing ? If this were true, how little did *Leo 3.* consult his own, or his Predecessour's Honour, who dissuaded the *Legates* of the Council at *Aquisgrane*, from continuing in the *Creed* that Addition of *Filioque* : For, when after a great deal of discourse concerning the Article and the Addition ; the *Legates* at last tell him, *That they perceived, his pleasure was, that it should be taken out of the Creed, and so every one left to his liberty.* His Answer is, *So it is certainly determined by me, and I would persuade you by all means to assent to it :*

Ita proculdubio à nostra parte decernitur ; ita quoque, ut à vestra assentiat, à nobis omnimodis suadet. Apud Sirmond. Concil. Gallic. Tom. 2. p. 256.

Baron. Annal. ad An. 809.

Phot. in ep. ad Patriarch. Aquileiens. Pet. Lombard. lib. 1. sent. dist. 11.

And, to manifest this to be his constant Judgment, he caused the *Constantinopolitan Creed*, without the Addition of *Filioque* to be inscribed in a greater Silver Tablet, and placed publickly in the Church, to be read of all, as appears by the Testimony of *Photius*, and *Peter Lombard*, that so all, both *Greeks* and *Latins*,

might see, that nothing was added to the *Creed*. Had not this now been a strange Action of his, if this Addition had been so long before in the time of *Damasus* ? Nothing then can be more evident, than that in this *Leo's* Time, no such Addition was made to the *Creed* : Therefore, it seems most probable, which the famous *Antoninus* delivers, that this Addition was made by *Pope Nicolaus 1.* For, when he relates the Causes, why

Tunc inter alias accusationes hoc principaliter posuit, Ipsum fore excommunicatum, quod apposuerat ad symbolum, Sp. Sanctum à filio procedere. Similiter & depositum, quod ipse Nicolaus Papa incidisset in sententiam tertii Concilii, Anton. Part. 3. Tit. 22. c. 13. sect. 10.

Concil. Florent. sess. 8.

Photius Excommunicated him, he mentions that in the first place, That he had made an Addition to the *Creed*, by making the Spirit to proceed from the Son ; and therefore had fallen under the Sentence of the *third Oecumenical Council*, which prohibited such Additions to be made. To which *P. Pithæus* subscribes likewise, and *Petavius* seems not to dissent ; the only thing which is pretended against it, is, that *Andreas Colossensis* in the Council at *Ferrara*, saith, That though *Photius* was a known and bitter Enemy of the *Latin Church*, yet he never objected this Addition against *Nicolaus* or *Adrian* ; but how strangely overseen *Andreas* was in these words, sufficiently appears by *Photius* his *Encyclical Epistle*, wherein he doth in Terms object this against the *Latins*, as appears by the words already produced. So that although you would willingly have set this Addition far enough off from the *Schism*, yet you see how improbable a Fiction you produce for it ; and withal you see, that this Addition, by the consent of your own most Learned and Impartial Writers, falls just upon the time when the *Schism* broke out, viz. in the time of *Nicolaus* and *Photius* ; and therefore, now judge you, whether these words were so long added before the *Schism*, that they could give no occasion to it.

2. The next thing to be considered; is, *Whether they, who added it, had power so to do?* Two things the Greeks insist on, to shew, that it was not done by sufficient Authority. 1. *Because all such Additions were directly prohibited by the Ephesine Council.* 2. *That supposing them not prohibited, yet the Pope had no power to add to the Creed without the consent of the Eastern Churches.*

1. *That such Additions were severely prohibited by the Ephesine Council:* The Sanction of which Council to this purpose hath been already produced, and is extant both in the *Acts* of the *Ephesine* and *Flarentine Councils*, in Concil. Eph. part. 1. Act. 6. p. 366. Concil. Florent. sess. 5. 187. which latter it is insisted on as the *Foundation* of the *Greeks Arguments* against the Addition of *Filioque*, by *Marcus Ephesus*; and the Reason he there gives of such a Sanction made by the Council at *Ephesus*, is, that after the *Nicene Council*, in several *Provincial Councils*, there were above thirty several *Expositions* made of the *Nicene Creed*; upon which, the second *Oecumenical Council* made a further *Explication* of it, explaining those things which belonged to the *Divinity* of the *Spirit*, and the *Incarnation* of *Christ*; and, because they did not prohibit any *Additions*, the *Nestorians* easily depraved the *Nicene Creed*, inserting their own *Opinions* into it (as appears by the *Confession of Faith* exhibited to the Council by *Charisius*) which being read in the Council, and the *Fathers* thereby understanding how easily, after this rate, *New Creeds* might be continually made in the Church, they severely prohibited any further *Additions* to be made to the Creed. And therefore, although they Decreed in that Council the *Virgin Mary* to be *divine*, in opposition to *Nestorius*; yet, they never offered to insert it into the Creed, although they apprehended it necessary to explain the *Oeconomy* of our *Saviour's Incarnation*. And that which much confirms the meaning of the Decree, to be the absolute prohibition of all kind of *Additions* to the Creed, is, the *Epistle* of *St. Cyril of Alexandria* to *Johannes Antiochenus*, wherein reciting this Decree of the Council, he adds these words as the *Explication* of it. *We neither permit our selves, or others to change one Word or Syllable of what is herein contained* (speaking of the *Nicene Creed*) which *Epistle* was read and approved in the fourth *Oecumenical Council*. ἡμεῖς οὐδὲν ἐπιτρέπομεν ἑαυτοῖς, ἢ ἑτέροις ἢ ἀλλοῖς ἀμείψαι τὴν ἐκκλησίαν ἐκείνην, ἢ ἰδὼν ὅτι παρὰ τὴν οὐρανὴν συνταβήν. p. 589. Sess. 5.

To this the *Latins* answered them, that which is still answered in the same case, *viz.* *That this Article of Filioque was only a Declaration, and not a prohibited Addition:* But the *Greeks* say, this Answer is unsatisfactory on these accounts. 1. *Because there is no reason to say, that Decree doth not forbid the inserting Declarations into the Creed.* 2. *That if it did not forbid that, yet there is as little reason to say, this was a meer Declaration.* 1. *Because there is no reason to say, that the Council did not forbid the inserting Declarations into the Creed:* For, as *Bessarion* well observes, it never was lawful to add new and distinct *Articles of Faith*, from those which are contained in *Scripture*, but the Church only undertook the *Explication* and *Declaration* of the things therein contained; and this was only lawful. Concil. Florent. sess. 8. p. 626. Therefore the *Ancient Fathers* had full liberty of explaining *Articles of Faith*, and using those *Explications*, as they judged most expedient, and to place them where they thought good, so it were not in *Scripture*: Thence they might insert them into the Creed, or elsewhere. But afterwards (*i. e.* after this Decree of the *Ephesine Council*) this liberty was partly taken away, and partly continued. For it never was, or will be, unlawful to explain or declare *Articles of Faith*; but to insert those *Explications* into the Creed, is now unlawful, because forbidden by the Decree of a *General Council*. For, saith he, the *Fathers* of the third Council, observing what great *Inconveniencies* had

had followed in the Church, upon the enlargement of *Creeeds*, and that no Injury could at all come by the Prohibition of any further Additions to be inserted (for by that means they should only be bound to believe no more than what those *Holy Fathers* believed; and who dare charge their Faith with Imperfection) and they did therefore wisely forbid all other Expositions of Faith to be inserted into the *Creed*, as he there at large proves. And in the progress of that Discourse, takes off that which *Bellarmino* looked on as the only satisfactory Answer, viz. That the Prohibition concerned only private Persons; For, saith he, it cannot be conceived, that the Council should take care about the Declarations of the *Creed*, made by particular Persons (whereas it always was, and is lawful for such to declare their Faith more particularly, as appears by the *Creed* of *Charisius*, received in this Council) but this they looked after, that the *Creed*, which was commonly received in the *Christian Churches*, and into which Men are Baptized, should receive no alteration at all. And to shew what their meaning was, though their Council was purposely assembled against *Nestorius*, yet they would not insert *Θεοτόκος* into the *Creed*. And the same Decree was observed in the 4, 5, 6, 7. Councils; which, by their Actions, did declare this to be the meaning of the *Ephesine Council*, that no Declarations whatsoever, should hereafter be inserted into the *Creed*. For, if they were meer Declarations, there was much less necessity of inserting them into the *Creed*, which was supposed to be a System of the necessary Articles of Faith.

2. There was as little reason to say, that this Article was a meer Declaration. For, the *Latins* pretended, that the Article of *Filioque*, was only a further Explication of that *ex Patre*. For, if so, then whosoever doth believe the Procession from the Father, doth believe all that is necessary to be believed: And therefore certainly it can be no Heresie not to believe the Procession from the Son, because that is only supposed to be a Declaration of that from the Father. And since you are so ready to charge the *Greek Church* with Heresie, I pray tell us whether this Article be a Declaration or not: If not, then the *Latins* were all deceived, who pleaded the lawfulness of inserting *Filioque* on that account; and consequently it must be a prohibited Addition; If it be, then shew us what Heresie lies in not acknowledging a meer Explication, when all that is supposed necessary is believed in the Substance of the Article. Moreover, *Bessarion* rightly distinguisheth between an Explication, τῶν ἐγκειμένων, from ἐκ τῶν ἐγκειμένων, and therefore grants that the *Filioque* might be said to be an Explication of something contained in the *Creed*, but not out of any thing contained in the *Creed*; and therefore the *Medium* being extrinsecal, it could not be said to be a meer Declaration. For, there can be no necessary Argument drawn from the Procession from the Father, to infer the Procession from the Son; but it must be proved from some extrinsecal distinct Argument.

3. Suppose this to be no prohibited Addition, yet what right had the Pope and his Council, without the consent of the Eastern Churches, to make this Addition to the *Creed*? For, the *Greeks* said, whatever Authority the Church of Rome had, is received by the Canons, and its Authority was therefore less than that of an Oecumenical Council, wherefore it could not justly repeal, or act contrary to the Decree of a General Council, as it did apparently in this case. By which means the *Latins* were driven off from those which they looked on as slighter Velitations, and took Sanctuary in the Plenitude of the Pope's Power, that therefore no Council could prescribe to him; there could be no necessity of his calling the Eastern Churches to debate this Addition, for he could do it of himself, by virtue of his own Authority in and over the Church. Here *Anselm* and

and *Bonaventure* think to secure themselves, and hither they are all driven at last. So that we plainly see, whatever else is pretended, the *Pope's Usurped Power* was that which truly gave occasion to the *Schism*. For, it was not the *Latins* believing the *Procession* from the Son, which made the separation between the *Eastern* and *Western Churches*, but the *Pope's pretending a Power to impose an Article of Faith in the Creed against the Decree of a former, and without the consent of a present Oecumenical Council*. If you pretend, that there hath been since an *Oecumenical Council at Florence*, which hath declared it; by that very answer you justify the *Greeks* before that *Council*, and so lay the guilt of the *Schism* wholly on the *Pope*, who did insert and impose this *Article*, before an *Oecumenical Council*. Thus still it appears, the cause of the *Schism* began at *Rome*; and by the same argument with which you charge them with *Heresie*, viz. the *Council at Florence*, you vindicate the *Greek Church* from *Schism*, in all the actions of it before that *Council*.

And this might suffice to shew, that it was not the *Levity, Vanity, or Ambition of the Greeks*, which gave the great occasion of the *Schism*, but the *Pride, Incroachments, and Usurpations of the Church of Rome*, as might largely be manifested from the History of those Times, when the *Schism* began. The rise of which ought to be derived from the times of the *Constantinopolitan, and Chalcedon Councils*; the second and fourth *Oecumenical*. For, the *Canons of those Councils decreeing equal Privileges to Constantinople, with those of Rome*; made the *Popes have a continual jealousy upon the Greek Church*, and watch all opportunities to disgrace it, and infringe the liberties of it. Thence came the Rage of *Leo* against *Anatolius the Patriarch of Constantinople*, in the time of *Martianus*; thence the Feud between *Simplicius and Felix 3. of Rome*, and *Acacius of Constantinople*, for defending the Privileges of his See, in opposition to the *Pope's*; insomuch that *Felix* fairly Excommunicates him, because he would not submit to the *Pope's Tryal* in the case of the *Patriarch of Alexandria*; which continued so long, that *Euphemius*, who succeeded *Acacius*, though he Excommunicated *Petrus Moggus of Alexandria*, yet could not be received into the Communion of the *Roman Church* by *Felix*, because he would not expunge the name of *Acacius* out of the *Diptychs of the Church*; and afterwards *Gelasius* refused it on the same grounds; which *Euphemius* still denying to do, the *Schism* continued. And, although afterwards the *Emperour Anastasius*, and the *Greek Church*, desired the making up of this Difference; yet no other Terms of Communion would be accepted by *Hormisdas*, without the expunging the name of *Acacius*. So implacably were they bent against the very memory of *Acacius*, for defending the Privilege of his See, that they would rather continue that lamentable *Schism*, than not avenge themselves upon him; and consequently, make all future *Patriarchs* fearful of opposing the *Pope's Authority*. If we look yet further, we shall still find the Ambition of the *Popes* to have caused all the Disturbance in the *Greek Churches*, although some of the *Patriarchs of Constantinople* cannot be excused from the same Faults. In the time of the second Council at *Nice*, *Pope Adrian* not only contends for the enlargement of his Jurisdiction, but threatens to pronounce them *Hereticks*, who did not consent to it, which makes *Petrus de Marca* say, That he supposeth [that] the first time ever any were charged with *Heresie* on such an account. The same Pretence we still find in all the *Schisms* which ever happened, as that in the time of *Photinus*, that afterward, in the time of *Michael Cerularius*, and in the successive Ages, still the Terms of Communion were, Submission to the Church of Rome, and acknowledging the Supremacy of that See, which the *Greeks* did then, and do still constantly deny; so that it was not the *Greeks Levity*, but the

Petrus de Marca, de Concord. Sac. Imp. l. 1. c. 1. sect. 5.

the Romanists Ambition and Usurpation which gave occasion to that fearful Schism.

§. 21. But for all this, *It must still be lawful for your Church to add, and Anathematize too* : Which his Lordship thought a little unreasonable, but it seems you do not : For, say you, *The Church did rightly Anathematize all such deniers* ; why so ? *Because the meaning of the Latin Church being understood by the Addition of Filioque, and that whosoever denied, must be supposed to deny the Procession, then it became Heresie to deny it, and the Church did rightly Anathematize all such deniers.* So you say indeed ; but, you would do well, 1. To shew, that the understanding the meaning of the *Latin Church*, is sufficient to make the deniers of what she affirms, to be *Hereticks*. 2. How any one that denies the *Filioque* must be supposed to deny the Procession. If you mean the Procession *a Filio*, you speak very wisely, but prove nothing ; for some might grant the Procession, and yet deny the lawfulness of your Churches adding to the Creed. 3. All this while we are to seek how the *Latin Church* can make any thing to be a *Heresie*, which was not so before. And therefore if your *Anathema's* have no better grounds, the *Greeks* need not much fear the effects of them. That your Church on any occasion is apt enough to speak loud words, we may very easily believe, but whether she had just cause to speak so big in this cause, is the thing in question, and we have already manifested the contrary.

P. 26. D. 3. His Lordship says, *It ought to be no easie thing, to condemn a Man of Heresie in foundation of Faith ; much less a Church ; least of all, so ample and large a Church as the Greek, especially so as to make them no Church. Heaven Gates were not so easily shut against multitudes, when St. Peter wore the Keys at his own*

P. 12. *Girdle.* To this you answer ; *Neither is the Roman-Catholick Church justly accusable of Cruelty (though the Bishop taxes her of it) because she is quick and sharp against those that fall into Heresie.* But, if she hath power to pronounce whom she please *Hereticks*, and on what account she please (as *Hadrian I.* in case of his *Patrimony*) and then it be commendable in her to deal with them as *Hereticks*, it must needs be dangerous opposing her in any thing, for such who dread her *Anathema's*. But his Lordship was not speaking of what was to be done, in case of notorious Heresie, but what tenderness ought to be used in condemning Men for Heresie ; and much more in condemning whole Churches for it, on such slender accounts as you do the *Greek Church*. You should shew, When *St. Peter*, or any of the *Apostles* did exclude Churches from Communion, for denying such Articles as that you charge the *Greek Church* with. And it would be worth your enquiry, why those in the *Corinthian Church*, who at least questioned the *Resurrection* ; those in the *Galatian and other Churches*, who asserted the *Necessity of the Ceremonial Law under the Gospel*, both which errors are by the *Apostle* said to be of so dangerous a nature ; are not *Anathematized* presently by the *Apostle*, and thrown out of the Church at least, to prevent the Infection of other Christians, if not for the good of the *Libertine Hereticks*, as you speak. Your mentioning *St. Peter's* proceeding with *Ananias and Sapphira*, must be acknowledged a very fit resemblance for your Church dealing with *Hereticks* ; only they whom you are pleased to account *Hereticks*, have cause to rejoyce, that since your Churches Good-will is so much discovered, she hath not the same miraculous Power : For, then she would be sure to have few left to oppose her. But do you really think, *Ananias and Sapphira's* fault was no greater than that of the *Greek Church*, that you produce this Instance ? And, do you think the Church enjoys still the same Power over Offenders, which *St. Peter* then had ? If not, to what purpose do you mention such things here ; unless to let us see, that it is want of something

something else besides will, which makes you suffer any whom you call *Hereticks* to live. That St. Paul chastiseth his untoward *Children*, indeed you tell us, from 1 Cor. 5. 5. 1 Tim. 1. 20. But if you bring this to any purpose, you must make the *Greeks Error*, as bad as *Incest*, or a *denying the Faith*; and when you have so done, you may hear of a further Answer. On what account your Church punisheth *Delinquents*, will be then necessary to be shewed, when you have a little further cleared what Power your Church hath to make *Delinquents* in such cases as you condemn the *Greek Church* for. But, as long as your Church is *Accuser*, *Witness*, and *Judge* too, you must never expect that your *Anathema's* will be accounted any other than *bruta fulmina*, noise, and no more.

O. N.

138:11a.

CHAP. II.

Of Fundamentals in General.

The Popish Tenet concerning Fundamentals, a meer Step to the Roman Greatness. The Question about Fundamentals stated. An Enquiry into the Nature of them. What are Fundamentals, in order to particular Persons; and what to be owned as such, in order to Ecclesiastical Communion. The Prudence and Moderation of the Church of England, in defining Articles of Faith. What judged Fundamental by the Catholick Church. No new Articles of Faith can become necessary. The Churches Power in propounding Matter of Faith, examined. What is a sufficient Proposition. Of the Athanasian Creed, and its being owned by the Church of England. In what Sense the Articles of it are necessary to Salvation. Of the distinction of the material and formal Object of Faith, as to Fundamentals. His Lordship's Integrity, and T. C.'s Forgery, in the Testimony of Scotus. Of Heresie, and how far the Church may declare Matters of Faith. The Testimony of St. Augustine vindicated.

THE *Greek Church* appearing not guilty of *Heresie*, by any evidence of §. 1:
Scripture, *Reason*, or the Consent of the *Primitive Church*, nothing is left to make good the Charge, but that the *Church of Rome* hath defin'd it to be so; which Pretence, at first view, carrying the greatest Partiality and Unreasonableness in it, great care is taken, that the Partiality be not discovered, by not openly mentioning the *Church of Rome*, but the *Church in General* (as though it were impossible to conceive any other *Church* but that at *Rome*) and for the unreasonableness of it, it must be confidently asserted, That all Points defin'd by the *Church* are *fundamental*: So to be sure the *Greek Church* will never escape the Charge of *Heresie*. For this end, Mr. Fisher in the Conference acknowledgeth, that when his Lordship had denied the Error of the *Greek Church* to be *Fundamental*, he was forced to repeat what he had formerly brought against Dr. White, concerning Points *Fundamental*. The reason of which was, that, easily perceiving that it was impossible to stand their Ground in the Charge on the *Greek Church* upon other Terms, he is forced to take Sanctuary in the *Churches Definition*; and if that will not make it good, there is nothing else remaining to do it. And this is the cause of the following *Dispute concerning Fundamentals*; wherein the main thing undertaken, is, the Proof, that the formal Reason of *Fundamentals* is to be taken from the *Definition of the present Church*; but, as this must be confessed to be the main *Fundamental* of the *Church of Rome*, (for which yet the thing being manifest, no *Definition* of that *Church* is necessary;) so withal, I doubt not, but it will be made evident in the progress of this Discourse,

P. 27. Sect.
10. n. 2.

course, that never was there any Pretence more Partial, Absurd, and Tyrannical than this is. Which his Lordship takes notice of in these words, which deserve a Repetition; *It was not the least means by which Rome grew to her Greatness, to blast every opposer she had with the name of Heretick or Schismatick; for this served to shrivell the Credit of the Persons. And the Persons once brought into Contempt and Ignominy, all the Good they desired in the Church, fell to Dust, for want of creditable Persons to back and support it. To make this proceeding good, in these latter Years, this course, it seems, was taken. The School that must maintain (and so they do) that all Points defin'd by the Church, are thereby Fundamental, necessary to be believed, of the Substance of Faith; and that, though it be determined quite extra Scripturam. And then leave the wise and active Heads to take order, that there be strength enough ready to determine what is fittest for them.* To this you answer, with an *argumēto*!

P. 13. n. 1.

You call it a Squib, a Fancy, a weak Discourse, one of the Bishop's Railleries, and what not. It seems it pinched you hard, you cry out so Tragically. But it is very certain, you are more impatient to have your Politicks, than your Errours discovered; and if you have any Curses more dreadful than others, they are sure to light on those who discover the Intrigues of your Designs. For if once Men come to discern how much more of Artifice and Cunning, than of Truth and Religion, there is in the managing the Interest of your Church, they would not easily think, the way to Heaven can lie among so many foldings of the old Serpent. And this is not to think as you tragically speak, *That all the World is turn'd Mad or Heathen*: For, thanks be to God, as *Catholick* as your Church is, it must be a huge *Catachresis* to take it for all the World: Neither do we think your Church mad, but very wise and *Politick* in these Pretences; and that still you are resolved to shew, that though other Churches may be more *Children of Light than yours* (ignorance being so much in favour with you) yet *yours is wiser in its Generation*. But how the pretending of your Church to Infallibility, and power to define Fundamentals, should make us imagine *all the World Heathen*, is not easie to conceive, unless you are conscious to your self, that such Pretences as these are, are the way to make it so. But we must see still how your *Cothurnus* fits you. *No Truth left upon Earth, but all become Juglers?* See what it is to be true *Catholicks*, that if they juggle, all the World must do so too; as though *totus mundus exercet histrioniam*, were *Latin* for the *Infallibility of the Church of Rome*. But have you indeed such a *Monopoly of Truth*, that if your Party prove *Juglers*, there will be no Truth left upon Earth? If you had said, none unsophisticated, yet even that had been a great *Truth* left upon Earth still. But I shall cut you short in what follows of your Declamation, by telling you, that though your Harangue were ten times longer than it is, and your Exclamations louder, and your Authorities better than of your *Prelates, Miracles, Doctors, Heads of Schools, Austere and Religious Persons* (in *English* Monks and Friars) yet all these would not one jot perswade us contrary to common Sense, and the large Experience of the World, That *Religion* is not made by you an Instrument to advance the *Pope's Ambition*, and that the *Church* is but a more plausible Name, whereby to maintain the *Court of Rome*. And we need not go from our present Subject, for a Proof of it. I will not charge this upon all Persons of your Communion, for all of them do not believe the State-principles of your Church; and others are kept, as much as may be, from all ways of discovering the great Designs of it; and therefore there may be so much Innocency and Simplicity in some, as may keep them from *prostituting their Salvation to the Pope's Greatness*: But this is no Plea on behalf of

of those who have the Managery of those Designs; who, if they do not see what things are fittest for the *Pope's* temporal Ends, will not long be thought fit for their Employment. But, is it not palpable how much you endeavour to shrivel Christianity into a Party and Faction, excluding all others that are not of your Party out of the Church, and consequently from hopes of Salvation, though never so Pious and Conscientious? Are not the far greatest part of the Opinions you contend for, against all the rest of the Christian World, such as are manifestly subservient to temporal Ends? And are not such more zealously disputed for, than the plain Articles of Faith, and the indispensable Precepts of the Christian Religion? Have you not found out all the Artifices imaginable, to enervate the Force of Christian Piety, by your Doctrines about *Repentance, Prayer, Indulgences, Probability, Purgatory*, and such like? And instead of those rational Acts of *Devotion*, which our *Religion* requires from us, have made choice of such fond, ludicrous, unintelligible pieces of Devotion (by the most who are concerned in them) as though you were resolved to see how much it was possible to *debauch Christianity*, and make it contemptible in the World? Add to these the Arts you have to violate Humane Societies, by dispensing with Oaths, breaking Faith, dissolving Obedience to Civil Authority, when it opposeth your Designs; and is it possible then for Persons not blind-folded with the grossest sort of implicit Faith, to judge otherwise, but the design of your Church, is to determine, *not what is truest, but what is fittest for your ends*? And, although you scurrilously call his Lordship's Discourse, *stuff that might serve sometimes for Pulpit-babble, to deceive the giddy Multitude, and cast a Mist before their Eyes*; yet you see, he was not afraid of what any Adversary could say against it, by writing it in a Polemical Discourse, in which we could be glad to see some of those famous *Legends*, and Seraphical Notions, which your Pulpit-entertainments consist so much of, especially where you are out of the reach of Hereticks, and then we should judge which looks more like babling, and deceiving the giddy Multitude. But, to let us see what Men of reach and Politicians you are, you have found out a strange *Fetich* in his Lordship's Discourse, *viz.* That all this is, *That they might not see the Impurity of their own English Protestant Church, even in its first rise under Henry the Eighth, and the People-cheating Policies it was beholding to for its Restauration under Queen Elizabeth, as may be seen in History.* History is a large Wood to bid us seek for these cheating Policies in; and if you had any other design, but meerly to shew your self a Politician in this, that you can *fortiter calumniari, use your Tongue Manfully when Reproaches are useful*; you would have produced some evidence so clear of them, as his Lordship here insists on in reference to your Church. But, as long as you converse only in *Generals*, you will give us leave to think who those are which use to do so, *viz. such grand Politicians* as your self. For the Particulars of our Reformation, we shall have occasion to vindicate them in another place, and therein shall easily manifest what an *Itch* you had to calumniate here, though you were sure to smart for it afterwards. That which you call Weakness of Judgment, or want of Charity in his Lordship, will be found to lie at another door, by our making it appear, that what you call a groundless and impossible Slander, is a real and undoubted Truth. But when you tell us, *That such Railleries do not become one that would be esteemed a grave Doctor of the English Church, an alterius orbis Patriarcha, as the ancient Primates of England have been call'd*: I know not whether you discover more judgment, or reading in it; your judgment in calling that an unbecoming *Raillery*, which is a great and seasonable Truth;

P. 13.

P. 14.

Truth ; *your reading*, in mistaking *Patriarcha* for *Papa*, or else you were willing to dissemble it, because then by the advantage of this *Title*, he might be fitter to discover the Artifices and Designs of his *Fellow-Pope*. The laying open of which is certainly vastly different from *sporting with all that can be serious on Earth* (*Man's Salvation*) as you most injuriously calumniate his Lordship in your next words, in affirming so of him, when his only design was, to clear the way to Man's Salvation, by discovering the Gins and Traps which are laid in the way of silly Men, by the pernicious subtilty of those of your Party.

§. 2.

The way being thus cleared, we come to the main Question, *viz*, *Whether all Points, defined by the Church, are Fundamentals* ; and here, because you tell us, *His Lordship is like one that provides for a Retreat or a Subterfuge, by cutting out a number of ambiguous distinctions* ; you give us fair hopes what clear Proceedings we may expect from you, who abhor as much the clear stating of a question, as *Foxes* do running in beaten Roads. But, as well as you love *them*, you must be drawn out of your *Holes*, which will be much for the advantage of Truth, though very little for yours. To come therefore close to the Business, that you may not think I seek Subterfuges, or Retreats, I shall wave all other Acceptions of *Fundamentals*, and take the Question in your own sense, that is, *for Points necessary to Salvation*. The Question then in Controversie between us, is this, *Whether the Ground or Reason why any thing is fundamental or necessary to Salvation, be, because it is defined by the Church to be so, and consequently, Whether all Points, defined by the Church, be not fundamental or necessary to Salvation?* For the occasion of this Controversie was from the *Greek Church*, whether her Error, as to the Procession from the *Son*, be fundamental or no, *i. e.* such as excludes her from being a *Church*, and consequently from Salvation. The ground of your Affirmation, is, because *the Church had defined it to be so* ; so that the Ground and Reason why any thing is supposed fundamental or necessary to Salvation, must be the Definition of the Church : But for our better understanding your meaning, you distinguish of two ways, whereby Points may be necessary to Salvation ; the one absolutely, by reason of the matter they contain ; which, say you, is so fundamentally necessary in it self, that not only the disbelief of it, when propounded by the Church, but the meer want of an express knowledge, and belief of it, will hinder Salvation ; and those are such Points, without the express belief whereof, no Man can be saved, which Divines call necessary necessitate medii ; others of this kind they call necessary necessitate præcepti, which all Men are commanded to seek after, and expressly believe ; so that a culpable Ignorance of them hinders Salvation, although some may be saved with invincible Ignorance of them. And all these are absolutely necessary to be expressly believed, either necessitate præcepti, or medii, in regard of the matter which they contain. But the rest of the Points of Faith are necessary to be believed necessitate præcepti, only conditionally, that is, to all such to whom they are sufficiently propounded, as defined by the Church : Which necessity proceeds not precisely from the material Object, or Matter contained in them ; but from the formal Object of Divine Authority, declared to Christians by the Churches Definition. Whether therefore the Points in question be necessary in the first manner or no, by reason of their precise matter ; yet if they be necessary, by reason of the Divine Authority, or formal Object of Divine Revelation, sufficiently declared and propounded to us, they will be Points Fundamental, that is, necessary to Salvation to be believed, as we have shewed Fundamental must here be taken. These words of yours containing the full state of the Question in your own Terms, and being the substance of all you say on this Controversie, I have recited at large ; that you may not complain, your meaning is mistaken in them. You assert then, that

P. 15.

that besides that *Necessity* which ariseth from the *Matter* of things to be believed, and from the absolute *Command* of God; there is another necessity *conditionally* upon the *Churches Definition*, but, supposing that *Definition*, the thing so propounded becomes as necessary to Salvation, as what is necessary from the matter; for in all Hypothetical Propositions, the Supposition being in act, the Matter becomes necessary. For, unless you speak of such a necessity, as becomes as universally obligatory, on supposition of the *Churches Definition*, as that which ariseth from the Matter, or absolute Command; you are guilty of the greatest Tergiversation, and perverting the state of the Question. For, otherwise that cannot be said to be fundamental or necessary to Salvation, in the sense of this Question, which is not generally necessary to Salvation to all Christians. For no Man was ever so silly, as to imagine, that the Question of *Fundamentals*, with respect to whole *Churches*, as it is here taken, can be understood in any other sense, than as the matter, call'd *Fundamental* or *Necessary*, must be equally fundamental and necessary to all Persons. And that this must be your meaning, appears by the rise of the Controversie, which concerns the whole *Greek Church*, which you exclude from being a *Church*, because she errs fundamentally, and that she errs fundamentally, because the *Church* hath defined it to be an Error. So that what the *Church* determines as Matter of Faith, is as necessary to be believed in order to Salvation, as that which is necessary from the Matter, or from an absolute Command. For, otherwise the *Greek Church* might not be in a *Fundamental Error*, notwithstanding the *Churches Definition*: The ground of this Error being *Fundamental*, not being derived from the Matter, or absolute Command, but from the *Churches Definition*. If therefore the denial of what the Church defines, doth exclude from Salvation; the necessity and obligation must be equal to that which ariseth from the Matter to be believed. And if the Church defines any particulars to be explicitly believed as necessary to Salvation, not only the *not disbelieving* them, but the *not explicit believing them*, will be as destructive to Salvation, as if the matter of the things themselves were necessary; or that it were absolutely commanded; for in those cases, you say, the not explicit believing is that which damns, and so on your Principles it will do here, when the explicit Belief is the thing defined by the Church. This will be more plain by an Instance. It is notoriously known, that at the shutting up of the Council of Trent, a *Confession of Faith* was drawn up, and confirmed by the Bull of Pius 4. A. D. 1564. and that, *ut unus & ejusdem fidei professio uniformiter ab omnibus exhibeatur*, That the Profession of one and the same Faith, may be made known to all, and declared uniformly by all. In which Confession, after the enumeration of the Articles contained in the Ancient Creed; there are many others added concerning Traditions, Seven Sacraments, the Decrees of the Council of Trent, as to original Sin and Justification; The Sacrifice of the Mass, Transubstantiation, Communion in one kind, Purgatory, Invocation of Saints, Worship of Images, Indulgences, the Pope's Supremacy, &c. All which are required to be believed with an equal assent to the former, as absolutely necessary to Salvation, and necessary Conditions of Catholick Communion. For thus it ends; *Hanc veram Catholicam Fidem, extra quam nemo salvus esse potest, quam in presenti sponte profiteor, & veraciter teneo, eandem integram & inviolatam usque ad extremum vite spiritum, &c.* This true Catholick Faith, without which none can be saved, which at present I profess, and truly hold, and will do whole and undefiled to my lives end, &c. Judge you now, whether an equal explicit Faith be not here required

Truth; *your reading*, in mistaking *Patriarcha* for *Papa*, or else you were willing to dissemble it, because then by the advantage of this *Title*, he might be fitter to discover the Artifices and Designs of his *Fellow-Pope*. The laying open of which is certainly vastly different from *sporting with all that can be serious on Earth* (*Man's Salvation*) as you most injuriously calumniate his Lordship in your next words, in affirming so of him, when his only design was, to clear the way to *Man's Salvation*, by discovering the Gins and Traps which are laid in the way of silly Men, by the pernicious subtilty of those of your Party.

§. 2.

The way being thus cleared, we come to the main Question, *viz*, *Whether all Points, defined by the Church, are Fundamentals*; and here, because you tell us, *His Lordship is like one that provides for a Retreat or a Subterfuge, by cutting out a number of ambiguous distinctions*; you give us fair hopes what clear Proceedings we may expect from you, who abhor as much the clear stating of a question, as *Foxes* do running in beaten Roads. But, as well as you love *them*, you must be drawn out of your *Holes*, which will be much for the advantage of Truth, though very little for yours. To come therefore close to the Business, that you may not think I seek Subterfuges, or Retreats, I shall wave all other Acceptions of *Fundamentals*, and take the Question in your own sense, that is, *for Points necessary to Salvation*. The Question then in Controversie between us, is this, *Whether the Ground or Reason why any thing is fundamental or necessary to Salvation, be, because it is defined by the Church to be so, and consequently, Whether all Points, defined by the Church, be not fundamental or necessary to Salvation?* For the occasion of this Controversie was from the *Greek Church*, whether her Error, as to the Procession from the *Son*, be fundamental or no, *i. e.* such as excludes her from being a *Church*, and consequently from Salvation. The ground of your Affirmation, is, because *the Church had defined it to be so*; so that the Ground and Reason why any thing is supposed fundamental or necessary to Salvation, must be the Definition of the Church: But for our better understanding your meaning, you distinguish of two ways, whereby Points may be necessary to Salvation; the one absolutely, by reason of the matter they contain; which, say you, is so fundamentally necessary in it self, that not only the disbelief of it, when propounded by the Church, but the meer want of an expresse knowledge, and belief of it, will hinder Salvation; and those are such Points, without the expresse belief whereof, no Man can be saved, which Divines call necessary necessitate medii; others of this kind they call necessary necessitate præcepti, which all Men are commanded to seek after, and expressly believe; so that a culpable Ignorance of them hinders Salvation, although some may be saved with invincible Ignorance of them. And all these are absolutely necessary to be expressly believed, either necessitate præcepti, or medii, in regard of the matter which they contain. But the rest of the Points of Faith are necessary to be believed necessitate præcepti, only conditionally, that is, to all such to whom they are sufficiently propounded, as defined by the Church: Which necessity proceeds not precisely from the material Object, or Matter contained in them; but from the formal Object of Divine Authority, declared to Christians by the Churches Definition. Whether therefore the Points in question be necessary in the first manner or no, by reason of their precise matter; yet if they be necessary, by reason of the Divine Authority, or formal Object of Divine Revelation, sufficiently declared and propounded to us, they will be Points Fundamental, that is, necessary to Salvation to be believed, as we have shewed Fundamental must here be taken. These words of yours containing the full state of the Question in your own Terms, and being the substance of all you say on this Controversie, I have recited at large; that you may not complain, your meaning is mistaken in them. You assert then, that

that besides that *Necessity* which ariseth from the *Matter* of things to be believed, and from the absolute *Command* of God; there is another necessity *conditionally* upon the *Churches Definition*, but, supposing that *Definition*, the thing so propounded becomes as necessary to Salvation, as what is necessary from the matter; for in all Hypothetical Propositions, the Supposition being in act, the Matter becomes necessary. For, unless you speak of such a necessity, as becomes as universally obligatory, on supposition of the *Churches Definition*, as that which ariseth from the Matter, or absolute Command; you are guilty of the greatest Tergiversation, and perverting the state of the Question. For, otherwise that cannot be said to be fundamental or necessary to Salvation, in the sense of this Question, which is not generally necessary to Salvation to all Christians. For no Man was ever so silly, as to imagine, that the Question of *Fundamentals*, with respect to whole *Churches*, as it is here taken, can be understood in any other sense, than as the matter, call'd *Fundamental* or *Necessary*, must be equally fundamental and necessary to all Persons. And that this must be your meaning, appears by the rise of the Controversie, which concerns the whole *Greek Church*, which you exclude from being a *Church*, because she errs fundamentally, and that she errs fundamentally, because the *Church* hath defined it to be an Error. So that what the *Church* determines as Matter of Faith, is as necessary to be believed in order to Salvation, as that which is necessary from the Matter, or from an absolute Command. For, otherwise the *Greek Church* might not be in a *Fundamental Error*, notwithstanding the *Churches Definition*: The ground of this Error being *Fundamental*, not being derived from the Matter, or absolute Command, but from the *Churches Definition*. If therefore the denial of what the Church defines, doth exclude from Salvation; the necessity and obligation must be equal to that which ariseth from the Matter to be believed. And if the Church defines any particulars to be explicitly believed as necessary to Salvation, not only the *not disbelieving* them, but the *not explicit believing them*, will be as destructive to Salvation, as if the matter of the things themselves were necessary; or that it were absolutely commanded; for in those cases, you say, the not explicit believing is that which damns, and so on your Principles it will do here, when the explicit Belief is the thing defined by the Church. This will be more plain by an Instance. It is notoriously known, that at the shutting up of the Council of Trent, a *Confession of Faith* was drawn up, and confirmed by the Bull of Pius 4. A. D. 1564. and that, *ut unius & ejusdem fidei professio uniformiter ab omnibus exhibeatur, That the Profession of one and the same Faith, may be made known to all, and declared uniformly by all*. In which Confession, after the enumeration of the *Articles* contained in the *Ancient Creed*; there are many others added concerning *Traditions*, *Seven Sacraments*, the *Decrees of the Council of Trent*, as to *original Sin* and *Justification*; *The Sacrifice of the Mass*, *Transubstantiation*, *Communion in one kind*, *Purgatory*, *Invocation of Saints*, *Worship of Images*, *Indulgences*, the *Pope's Supremacy*, &c. All which are required to be believed with an equal assent to the former, as *absolutely necessary to Salvation*, and necessary Conditions of *Catholick Communion*. For thus it ends; *Hanc veram Catholicam Fidem, extra quam nemo salvus esse potest, quam in presenti sponte profiteor, & veraciter teneo, eandem integram & inviolatam usque ad extremum vitae spiritum, &c. This true Catholick Faith, without which none can be saved, which at present I profess, and truly hold, and will do whole and undefiled to my lives end, &c.* Judge you now, whether an equal explicit Faith be not here required

required to the Definitions of the Church, as to the Articles of the Creed; and if so, there must be an equal necessity, in order to Salvation, of believing both of them, it being here so expressly declared, that these Definitions are *Integral Parts* of that *Catholick Faith*, without which there is *no Salvation*. And what could be more said of those things, whose matter, or absolute Precept do make them necessary? This Confession of Faith therefore gives us the truest state of the present Question, in these Particulars. 1. That the *Definitions* of the Church are to be believed, to be as necessary to Salvation, as the Articles of the *Ancient Creed*, without the belief of which no Salvation is to be expected. 2. That the *explicit Belief* of these Definitions as necessary to Salvation, may be required in order to *Catholick Communion*, and that they are to be believed of all as such, *because they are defined by the Church*. So that the Question is not, *What is so required by the Churches Definition, declared and propounded to us, that it ought not to be disbelieved without mortal and damnable Sin, which unrepented destroys Salvation*, as you stated it; for this seems only to respect the Faith of particular Persons, who are to believe according as the Proposition may be judged sufficient: But the true state of the Question, is, Whether any *Definitions* of the Church may be believed as *Necessary Articles of Faith*; and whether they may be imposed on others to be believed as such, so that they may be excluded *Catholick Communion* if they do not. For this is really the true state of the Question, between your Church and ours, ever since the *Council of Trent*; and as to it thus stated (as it ought to be) I do most readily joyn issue with you.

§. 3. For the clearing of which important *Question*, on which the main cause of our being separated from your Communion depends, these three things will be necessary to be exactly discussed. 1. *What the Grounds are on which any thing doth become necessary to Salvation?* 2. *Whether any thing, whose matter is not necessary, and is not required by an absolute Command, can by any means whatsoever afterwards become necessary?* 3. *Whether the Church hath power by any Proposition or Definition to make any thing become necessary to Salvation, and to be believed as such, which was not so before?* These three I suppose you cannot deny, but will take in all that is considerable in this Controversie. Which I shall with the more care examine, because nothing tends more to the Peace of the Christian World, than a thorough and clear discussion of it; and nothing causeth more the *Schisms* and *Divisions* of it, than the want of a right and due Conception of it.

1. *What the Grounds are on which any thing doth become necessary to Salvation?* For our better understanding of which, we must consider two things. 1. *What things are necessary to the Salvation of Men as such, or considered in their single and private Capacities?* 2. *What things are necessary to be owned in order to Salvation, by Christian Societies, or as the Bonds and Conditions of Ecclesiastical Communion?* The want of understanding this distinction of the necessity of things, hath caused most of the Perplexities and Confusion in this Controversie of *Fundamentals*.

1. *What those things are which are necessary to the Salvation of particular Persons?* But that we may make all as clear as possible, in a matter of so great intricacy, two things again must be enquired into. 1. *What the Ground is, why any thing becomes necessary to be believed in order to Salvation?* 2. *What the Measure and Extent is of those things which are to be believed by particular Persons as necessary to Salvation?*

1. *What the Ground or Foundation is, on which things become necessary to be believed by particular Persons?* And that which is the true ground of the necessity, why any thing is to be believed, is the proper ratio of a Fundamental

mental Article. For, I suppose it a much clearer notion of *Fundamentals*, to understand them, not as *Principles*, from whence Deductions may be drawn of *Theological Truths*; but in regard of that immediate respect which they have to Men's Salvation. Those things therefore which are necessary to be explicitly believed by particular Persons, are *Fundamentals* in order to their Salvation. Now all belief in this case supposing *Divine Revelation*, nothing can be imagined to be necessary to be believed, but what may be certainly known to be of *Divine Revelation*. But when we consider, that besides the general Reason of believing what God hath Revealed; we must either suppose, that all things are of equal necessity, which are revealed in order to the general End of this *Revelation*; or, that some things therein contained, are expressly necessary to the End, and other things to be believed on the general account of Faith, so far as they are known to be of *Divine Revelation*. Now from hence ariseth a twofold necessity of things to be believed; the first more general and large, the second more particular and absolute. The first depends upon the *formal Reason* of Faith; the second, on the particular *End of Divine Revelation*. That which depends on the *formal Reason* of that *Affent* we call *Faith*, is that which supposeth *Divine Veracity*, or the impossibility of God's deceiving us in any thing revealed by Him; now this extends to all things whatsoever, which are supposed by Men to be of *Divine Revelation*. For, though Men may mistake in the matter, yet the Reason of Assent holding, under that Mistake, they are bound necessarily to believe whatever is supposed by them to be *Divine Revelation*. Here lies no difficulty in the ground of Faith, but all the care is to be used in the search into the matters which are to be believed on the account of this *Revelation*. But here we are to consider, that the only thing which is in general, and absolutely necessary to Salvation, is the general Act of Faith, viz. *Believing whatever God reveals to be true*, else God's Veracity would be call'd in question; but particular Objects cannot be said, on this account, to be absolutely and universally necessary, but only so far as there are sufficient Convictions, that those particulars are of *Divine Revelation*. And, the more general and extensive the Means of Conviction are, the more large and universal is the Obligation to Faith. As, that the *Scriptures* contain in them the *Word of God*, is a Matter of more universal Obligation, than particular things therein revealed; because the belief of the one depends upon the acknowledgment of the other. And withal, supposing it believed, that the Matters contained in *Scripture* are of *Divine Revelation*; yet all things are not *equally clear to all Capacities*, that they are therein contained. Which is a sufficient Ground for us, to say, It was not *God's Intention*, that all things contained in his Word, should be believed with the same degree of necessity by all Persons. And therefore, though the general Reason of Faith depends on *God's Veracity*, yet the particular obligation to the belief of particular things, as revealed by God, depends on the *Means*, whereby we may be assured, that such things are revealed by him: Which Means admitting of so great *Variety*, as to the Circumstances and Capacities of particular Persons, there can be no general *Rule* set down what things are necessary to be believed by all particular Persons. For, those who have greater means of knowledge, a larger capacity, and clearer proposal, are bound to believe more things explicitly, than those who want all these, or have a lower degree of them. In which case, it is an unreasonable thing to say, that such a one, who disbelieves any thing propounded to him as a Matter

H

of

P. 15. of Faith, doth presently call in question *God's Veracity*; for he may as firmly believe that as any in general, and yet may have ground to question whether *God's Veracity* be at all concerned in that which is propounded to him as a Matter of Faith; because he sees no reason to believe that this was ever revealed by God. And, by this, a clear answer is given to that *Question*, which you propose: *Whether all those Truths which are sufficiently proposed to any Christian, as defined by the Church for Matter of Faith, can be dis-believed by such a Christian, without mortal and damnable sin, which unrepented destroys Salvation?* To which the Answer is easie upon the grounds here assigned: For this Question concerning particular Persons, and particular Objects of Faith, the Resolution of it doth depend upon the sufficiency of the means, to convince such a Person, that whatever is propounded as Defined by the Church for a Matter of Faith, is certainly and truly so. For to instance in any one of those new Articles of Faith, *Transubstantiation*, or the *Pope's Supremacy*, &c. you tell me, These are necessary to be believed, or at least cannot be dis-believed without sin (which is all one in this case, supposing clear conviction, for then what cannot be dis-believed without Sin, must be explicitly believed.) I desire to know the *Grounds* why they may not? You tell me, These are Truths which are sufficiently proposed to me, as defined by the Church for Matters of Faith. I deny the Churches Proposition to be sufficient to convince me, that these are Matters of Faith; for I understand not what Power your Church hath to define any thing for *Matter of Faith*: If I granted that, I must understand what you mean by *sufficient Proposition*; whether that your Church hath so defined them, or that she hath power so to define them; and because I am heartily willing to believe any thing that I have reason to believe is a Matter of Faith; certainly it can be no Sin in me, not to believe that which I can see no ground at all to believe, either in it self, or because of your Churches Definition. And all this while, I have as high thoughts of *God's Veracity*, as you can have, and it may be higher; because I Interest it not in the false and contradictory Definitions of your Church. If therefore you will prove it to be a damnable Sin not to believe whatever is proposed by your Church for a Matter of Faith, you must first prove, that there is as universal an Obligation to believe whatever is sufficiently proposed as defined by the Church for Matter of Faith, as there is to assent to whatever God reveals as true. And when you have done this, I will give you leave to state the Question as you do: For then you would offer something to the proof of it, which now you do not. The substance then of what concerns the obligation to Faith, as to particular Objects, on the account of *Divine Revelation*, lies in the Means of Conviction concerning those particular Objects being divinely revealed, which being various, the degrees of Assent must be various too: But yet so that the more Men are negligent of the Means of Conviction, the more culpable their Unbelief is; but where Men use all moral diligence to understand what is revealed, and what not, if they cannot be convinced, that some particular thing is of Divine Revelation; it is hard to prove them guilty of mortal and damnable Sin, without first proving, that God absolutely requires from Men an Assent to that, which it is impossible in their Circumstances they should believe. And this is the first sort of things necessary to be believed by particular Persons; such as are believed on the general account of *God's Veracity* in revealing them.

S. 4. But because there must be a more particular Reason assigned of any such intention in God to reveal his Mind to the World, viz. some peculiar end which he had in it; therefore a further degree of the necessity of things

to be believed, must be enquired after, *viz.* such as have an immediate and necessary respect to the Prosecution of that End. Now the only End assignable of that great expression of *Divine Goodness*, in declaring to Man the *Will of God*, is the *Eternal Welfare and Happiness* of Mankind, for nothing else can be imagined suitable and proportionable to the *Wisdom and Goodness* of God; besides that, this is expressly mentioned in *Scripture* as God's great End in it. Now this being the great End of Divine Revelation, the necessity of things to be believed absolutely, and in themselves, must be taken from the reference or respect which they have to the attainment of this End. And, although the distinction be commonly received, of *necessity of the Means*, and of *the Command*, as importing a *different kind of necessity*, yet in the sense I here take Necessity in, the Members of that distinction do to me seem *coincident*. For I cannot see any reason to believe that God should make the belief of any thing *necessary*, by an *absolute Command*, but what hath an immediate tendency by way of *means*, for the attainment of this End: For otherwise, that which is called the *Necessity of Precept*, falls under the former degree of *Necessity*, *viz.* That which is to be believed on the general account of Divine Revelation. And, although these things which are necessary, as *Means*, are to be believed on the same *formal Reason* of Faith; yet since God had a different End in the Revelation of these from the other, therefore there is a necessity of putting a difference between them. For, supposing God to have such a design to bring the Souls of Men to Happiness; in order to this End some Means must be *necessary*, and these must consequently be revealed to Men, because they are so necessary in order to such an End; now it is apparent, All things contained in *Scripture*, are not of that nature; some being at so great a remove from this End, that the only reason of believing them, is, because they are contained in that Book, which we have the greatest reason to believe, contains nothing false in it. Now the only way whereby we may judge of the nature of these things, is, from the consideration of what is made the most necessary Condition in order to Happiness; and the way by which we may come to it. And nothing being more evident, than that the *Gospel* contains in it a *Covenant of Grace*, or the Conditions on which our Salvation depends; whatever is necessary in order to our performance of the Conditions required of us, must be necessary to be believed by all. The *Gospel* therefore tending Happiness upon the Conditions of our *believing in Christ, and walking in him*; these two things are indispensably necessary to Salvation (where the *Gospel* is known, for we have no reason to enquire into the Method of God's proceeding with others?) *An hearty Assent to the Doctrine of Christ, and a conscientious walking according to the Precepts of it.* But to undertake to define *what parts* of that Doctrine are necessary to Salvation, and *what not*, seems to me wholly unnecessary; because the *Assent to the Doctrine of Christ*, as revealed from God, must necessarily carry in it so much as is sufficient in order to Salvation. Whatever therefore is necessary to a *Spiritual Life*, is necessary absolutely to Salvation, and no more; but what, and how much that is, must be gathered by every one as to himself from *Scripture*; but is impossible to be defined by others, as to all Persons. But in all, *Faith towards God, and in our Lord Jesus Christ; and Repentance from dead Works*, are absolutely and indispensably necessary to Salvation, which imply in them, both an universal readiness of mind to believe and obey God in all things: And by this we see, what the Rule and Measure of the necessity of things to be believed is, as to particular Persons; which lies in these things.

1. *Whatever God hath revealed, is undoubtedly and infallibly true.*
2. *Whatever appears to me, upon sufficient enquiry, to be revealed by God, I am bound to believe it by virtue of God's Veracity.*
3. *All things not equally appearing to all Persons to be revealed of God, the same measure of necessity cannot be extended to all Persons.*
4. *An universal Assent to the Will of God, and universal Obedience to it, are absolutely and indispensably necessary to all Persons, to whom God's Word is revealed.*

Thus much may suffice concerning what is necessary to be believed by particular Persons, considered as such.

§. 5.

But this Controversie never need break *Christian Societies* in that sense, but the great difficulty lies in the other part of it, which is most commonly strangely confounded with the former, viz. *What things are necessary to be owned, in order to Church Societies, or Ecclesiastical Communion?* For which, we must consider, that the Combination of *Christian Societies*, or that which we call the *Catholick Church*, doth subsist upon the belief of what is necessary to Salvation. For the very notion of a *Christian Church* doth imply the belief of all those things, which are necessary in order to the end of *Christian Religion*, which is Men's Eternal Happiness. From whence three things must be taken notice of.

1. *That the very Being of a Church, doth suppose the necessity of what is required to be believed in order to Salvation.* For else there could not be such a thing as a *Church* imagined, which is only a Combination of Men together, upon the belief of such a Doctrine as necessary to Salvation; and for the performance of those Acts of Worship which are suitable thereto: Therefore to assert the *Church* to have power to make things necessary to Salvation, is not only absurd, but destructive to the *Being* of that *Church*. For when it offered to define any thing to be necessary, which was not so before, was it a *Church* or no? If it was a *Church*, it believed all things necessary: If it believed *all things* necessary, before it *defined*; how comes it to make *more things* necessary by its *Definition*? But of this more afterwards.

2. *Whatever Church owns those things which are antecedently necessary to the Being of a Church, cannot so long cease to be a true Church.* Because it retains that which is the Foundation of the *Being* of the *Catholick Church*. Here we must distinguish those things in the *Catholick Church*, which give its *Being*, from those things which are the proper *Acts* of it, as the *Catholick Church*. As to this latter, the solemn Worship of God in the way prescribed by him, is necessary; in order to which there must be supposed lawful *Officers* set in the *Church*, and *Sacraments* duly administered: But these, I say, are rather the *Exercise* of the *Communion* of the *Catholick Church*, than that which gives its *Being*, which is, the belief of that *Religion* whereon its *Subsistence* and *Unity* depends; and as long as a *Church* retains this, it keeps its *Being*, though the *Integrity* and *Perfection* of it depends upon the due exercise of all Acts of *Comunion* in it.

3. *The Union of the Catholick Church depends upon the Agreement of it, in making the Foundations of its Being, to be the grounds of its Communion.* For the *Unity* being intended to preserve the *Being*, there can be no reason given, why the Bonds of *Union* should extend beyond the *Foundation* of its *Being*, which is, the owning the things necessary to the *Salvation* of all. From whence it necessarily follows, that whatsoever *Church* imposeth the belief of other things *as necessary to Salvation*, which were not so antecedently necessary to the *Being* of the *Catholick Church*, doth, as much as in it lies, break the *Unity* of it; and those *Churches*, who desire to preserve its

Unity,

Unity, are bound thereby not to have Communion with it so long as it doth so. Of what great Consequence these Principles are to the true understanding the distance between our Church and yours, if you see not now, you may feel afterwards.

These things being premised, I come to that which is the main Subject of the present Dispute, which is, *What those things are which ought to be owned by all Christian Societies as necessary to Salvation, on which the Being of the Catholick Church depends.* If we can find any sure footing for the Definition of these, we shall thereby find what the necessary Conditions of Ecclesiastical Communion are, and consequently where the proper cause of Schism lies in transgressing those Bounds, and what Foundations may be laid for the Peace of the Christian World. Which being of so vast importance, would require a larger discussion, than this place will admit of: But so far as is pertinent to our present Subject, I shall enquire into it; and give an account of my Thoughts, in these Propositions.

1. *Nothing ought to be owned as necessary to Salvation by Christian Societies, but such things, which, by the judgment of all those Societies, are antecedently necessary to the Being of the Catholick Church.* For, no reason can be assigned (as I said before) why the Bonds of Union should be extended beyond that which is the Churches Foundation; neither can there any reason be given why any thing else should be judged necessary to the Churches Communion, but what all those Churches (who do not manifestly dissent from the Catholick Church of the first Ages) are agreed in, as necessary to be believed by all; this will be further explained afterwards. Only I add here, when I speak of the necessary Conditions of Ecclesiastical Communion, I speak of such things which must be owned as necessary Articles of Faith, and not of any other Agreements for the Churches Peace. I deny not therefore, but that in case of great Divisions in the Christian World, and any National Churches reforming it self, that Church may declare its sense of those Abuses in Articles of Religion, and require of Men a Subscription to them; but then we are to consider, that there is a great deal of difference between the owning some Propositions in order to Peace, and the believing of them as necessary Articles of Faith. And this is clearly the state of the Difference between the Church of Rome, and the Church of England. The Church of Rome imposeth new Articles of Faith to be believed as necessary to Salvation; as appears by the formerly cited Bull of Pius 4. Which Articles contain in them the Justification of those things which are most excepted against by other Churches; and by her imposing these as the Conditions of her Communion, she makes it necessary for other Churches, who would preserve the Unity of the Catholick Church upon her true Foundations, to forbear her Communion. But the Church of England makes no Articles of Faith, but such as have the Testimony and Approbation of the whole Christian World of all Ages, and are acknowledged to be such by Rome it self, and in other things she requires Subscription to them not as Articles of Faith, but as Inferiour Truths, which she expects a submission to, in order to her Peace and Tranquility. So the late Learned L. Primate of Ireland often expresseth the sense of the Church of England, as to her thirty nine Articles. Neither doth the Church of England, saith he, define any of these Questions, as necessary to be believed, either necessitate medii, or necessitate præcepti, which is much less; but only bindeth her Sons, for Peace sake, not to oppose them. And in another place more fully. We do not suffer any Man to reject the thirty nine Articles of the

Bishop Bramhall. Schism Guarded. Sect. 7. p. 396.

Sect. 1. cap. 11. p. 190. V. Replication to the Bishop of Chalcedon. p. 264.

Church

Church of England at his pleasure ; yet neither do we look upon them as Essentials of Saving Faith, or Legacies of Christ and his Apostles : But in a mean, as Pious Opinions fitted for the Preservation of Unity ; neither do we oblige any Man to believe them, but only not to contradict them. By which we see, what a vast difference there is between those things which are required by the *Church of England*, in order to Peace ; and those which are imposed by the *Church of Rome*, as part of that Faith, *extra quam non est salus*, without belief of which there is no Salvation. In which she hath as much violated the *Unity of the Catholick Church*, as the *Church of England* by her *Prudence and Moderation* hath studied to preserve it.

§. 7. 2. *Nothing ought to be imposed as a necessary Article of Faith to be believed by all, but what may be evidently propounded to all Persons, as a thing which God did require the explicit belief of.* It being impossible to make any thing appear a necessary Article of Faith, but what may not only be evidently proved to be revealed by God, but that God doth oblige all Men to the belief of it in order to Salvation. And therefore none of those things, whose obligation doth depend on variety of Circumstances, ought in reason be made the Bonds of that Communion which cannot take notice of that variety as to Mens Conditions and Capacities. There are many things in *Christian Religion*, which, whosoever believes the truth of it, cannot but easily discern to be necessary in order to the profession and practice of it, in most of which the common Sense and Reason of Mankind is agreed. Not only the *Existence of a Deity*, the clear discovery of the *Wisdom, Goodness and Power of God*, with his *Providence* over the World, and the *Immortality of Souls*, being therein most evidently revealed ; but, the way and manner of the restitution of Men's Souls by Faith in *Jesus Christ* as our only Saviour, and Obedience to his Commands, is so fully laid down in the clearest Terms, that no rational Man, who considers the nature of *Christian Religion*, but must assert the profession of all these things to be necessary to all such, who own *Christian Religion* to be true. But there are many other things in *Christian Religion*, which are neither so clearly revealed in the *Scriptures*, nor unanimously assented to in any Age of the *Christian Church* ; and, why any such things should be made the Conditions of that Communion in the *Catholick Church*, whose very Being depends only on necessary things, would puzzle a *Philosopher* to understand. As if none should be accounted *Mathematicians*, but such as could square Circles ; and none *Naturalists*, but such as could demonstrate whether quantity were infinitely divisible or no : Much so it is, if none should be accounted Members of the *Catholick Church*, but such as own the truth and necessity of some at least as disputable Points, as any in Religion. Let therefore any *Romanist* tell me, whether the *Pope's Supremacy* be as clear in *Scripture*, as that *Christ is Saviour of the World* ; whether *Purgatory* be as plain as *Eternal Life* ; *Transubstantiation* as evident, as that the *Eucharist ought to be administred* ; whether *Invocation of Saints* be as manifest, as the *Adoration of God* ; the *Doctrine of Indulgencies*, as *Repentance from dead Works* ; and if there be so great a clearness in the Revelation of the one, and so far from it as to the other ; let them give any just account why the belief of the one is made as necessary to Salvation as the other is. Certainly, such who take in things, at least so disputable as all these are, and enforce the belief of them in order to their Communion, cannot otherwise be thought but to have a design to exclude a great part of the *Christian World* from their Communion ; and, to do so, and then cry out of them as *Schismatics*, is the most unreasonable Proceeding in the World.

3. *Nothing*

3. Nothing ought to be required as a necessary Article of Faith, but what hath been believed and received for such by the Catholick Church of all Ages. For, since necessary Articles of Faith are supposed to be so antecedently to the Being of the Catholick Church, since the Catholick Church doth suppose the continual acknowledgment of such things as are necessary to be believed; it is but just and reasonable to admit nothing as necessary, but what appears to have been so universally received. Thence it is, that *Antiquity, Universality, and Consent*, are so much insisted on by *Vincentius Lerinensis*, in order to the proving any thing to be a necessary Article of Faith. But the great Difficulty of this lies in finding out what was received for a necessary Article of Faith, and what was not by the Catholick Church; which being a Subject as necessary, as seldom spoken to, I shall not leave it untouched, although I must premise, that Rule to be much more useful in discovering what was not looked on as a necessary Article of Faith, than what was; and therefore I begin with that first.

1. It is sufficient evidence, that was not looked on as a necessary Article of Faith, which was not admitted into the Ancient Creeds. Whether all those Declarations which were inserted in the enlargements of the Apostolical Creed, by the Councils of Nice and Constantinople, and in that Creed which goes under the name of Athanasius, were really judged by the Catholick Church of all Ages, to be necessary to Salvation, is not here my business to enquire; but there seems to be a great deal of Reason for the Negative, that what was not inserted in the Ancient Creeds, was not by them judged necessary to be believed by all Christians. I know, it is said by some of your Party, That the Apostolical Creed did only contain those Articles which were necessary to be believed, in opposition to the present Heresies which were then in the Church. As though the necessity of believing in Christians, came only by an Antiperistasis of the opposition of Hereticks; And if there had been no Hereticks to have denied God's being the Creatour, and Christ's being the Saviour; it had not been necessary to have believed either of them so explicitly as now we do. But when we speak of all things necessary to be believed by all; I mean not, that all Circumstances of things contained in those Creeds are necessary to be believed in order to Salvation; but, that all those things which were judged as necessary to be believed by all, were therein inserted, will appear to any one who either considers the expressions of the Ancients concerning the Creeds then in use; or the primary reason why such Summaries of Faith were ever made in the Christian Church. The Testimonies of the Fathers to this purpose are so well known in this Subject, that it were a needless task to repeat them, who so unanimously assert the sufficiency, unalterableness, and perfection of that Faith, which is contained in the Creed; making it, the sum of all necessary Doctrines, the Foundation of the Catholick Faith, and of the Church, the first and sole Confession of Evangelical Doctrine. Of all which, and many more expressions to the same purpose, produced not only by our Writers, but by yours

Irenaeus l. 1. c. 2, 3. Tertul. de veland. virgin. c. 1. de praescript. c. 13, 14. Cyril. Hierosolymit. Catech. 4, 5. Hieron. ep. 61. ad Pammach. Augustin. de symbol. ad Catech. l. 3. c. 1. de temp. serm. 115, 119, 131, 181. Ambros. serm. 38. de jejun. & Quadrag. &c. Hilar. ad Constant. Aug. Ruffinus in symbol. c. 2.

too, no tolerable sense can be made, without asserting, that whatever was judged necessary to be believed by all, by the Catholick Church of that Age they lived in, or before them, was therein contained. Besides, what account can be given, why any such Summaries of Faith should at all be made either by Apostles, or Apostolical Persons; but only for that end, that necessary Articles of Faith might be reduced into such a compass, as might become portable to the weakest Capacities? If the rise of Creeds were (as most proba-

ble

ble it was) from the things propounded to the *Gatechumens* to be believed in order to Baptism, can we reasonably think, that any thing judged necessary to be believed, should be left out? If the *Apostolical Creed* be a summary comprehension of that *Form of sound Doctrine*, which the *Apostles* delivered to all Christians at their first Conversion (as it is generally supposed) either we must think the *Apostles* unfaithful in their Work, or the *Creed* an unfaithful account of their Doctrine, or that such things which were supposed universally necessary to be believed, are therein comprehended. Which is sufficient for my purpose, that nothing ought to be looked on as a necessary Article of Faith, or was so esteemed by the *Catholick Church*, which is not contained in the Ancient Creeds.

2. Nothing ought to be judged a necessary Article of Faith, but *what was universally believed by the Catholick Church, to be delivered as such by Christ, or his Apostles*. So that it is not the judgment, but the Testimony of the *Catholick Church*, which must be relied on, and that Testimony only, when universal, as delivering what was once infallibly delivered by *Christ*, or his *Apostles*. From whence it follows, that any one who will undertake to make out any thing as a necessary Article of Faith, by *Catholick Tradition* meely, must do these things :

1. He must make it appear to be universally embraced at all times, and in all places, by such who were Members of the *Catholick Church*.

2. That none ever opposed it, but he was presently disowned as no Member of the *Catholick Church*, because opposing something necessary to Salvation.

3. That it be delivered by all those Writers of the *Church*, who give an account of the *Faith of Christians*, or what was delivered by *Christ* and his *Apostles* to the *Church*.

4. That it was not barely looked on as necessary to be believed by such as might be convinced it was of *Divine Revelation*, but that it was delivered with a necessity of its being explicitly believed by all.

5. That what is delivered by the consent of the *Writers* of the *Catholick Church*, was undoubtedly the *Consent* of the *Church* of those Ages.

6. That all those *Writers* agree not only in the *Belief* of the thing it self, but of the *Necessity* of it to all Christians.

7. That no *Writers* or *Fathers* of succeeding *Ages*, can be supposed to alter in the belief, either of the matters believed before, or the necessity of them.

8. That no *Oppositions* of Hereticks, or Heats of Contention, could make them judge any Article so opposed, to be *more necessary*, than it was judged before that Contention; or they themselves would have judged it, had it not been so opposed.

9. That when they affirm many *Traditions* to be *Apostolical*, which yet varied in several Churches, they could not affirm any *Doctrine* to be *Apostolical*, which they were not universally agreed in.

10. That when they so plainly assert the sufficiency of the *Scriptures* as a Rule of Faith, they did yet believe something necessary to Salvation, which was not contained therein.

When you, or any one else, will undertake to make good these Conditions; I shall then begin to believe, that something may be made to appear to be a necessary Article of Faith, which is not clearly revealed in Scripture, but not before: But till then this *Negative* will suffice, that nothing ought to be embraced, as the judgment of the Church concerning a necessary Article of Faith, but what appears to be clearly revealed in Scripture, and universally embraced by the *Catholick Church* of all Ages.

3. Nothing

3. Nothing ought to be looked on as a necessary Article of Faith, by the judgment of the Catholick Church, the *denial of which was not universally opposed, and condemned as Heresie*. For otherwise the Catholick Church was very little sensible of the honour of *Christian Faith*, if it suffered Dissenters in necessary things, without putting a mark of dishonour upon them. Therefore we may conclude, that whatever was patiently born with in such as dissented from the generality of Christians, especially, if considerable *Persons* in the Church, were the Authors or Fomenters of such Opinions, however true the contrary Doctrine was supposed to be, yet it was not supposed necessary, because then the opposers would have been condemned of Heresie, by some open Act of the Catholick Church.

But if, beyond these *Negatives*, we would enquire what was positively believed as necessary to Salvation by the Catholick Church; we shall hardly find any better way, than by the Articles of the *Ancient Creeds*, and the universal opposition of any new Doctrine on its first appearance; and the condemning the broachers of it for *Heresie* in *Oecumenical Councils*, with the continual Disapprobation of those Doctrines by the *Christian Churches of all Ages*. As is clear in the cases of *Arrius* and *Pelagius*. For it seems very reasonable to judge, that since the necessary Articles of Faith were all delivered by the *Apostles* to the Catholick Church, since the Foundation of that Church lies in the belief of those things, which are necessary, that nothing should be delivered contrary to any necessary Article of Faith, but the Church, by some evident Act, must declare its dislike of it, and its resolution thereby to adhere to that necessary Doctrine, which was once delivered to the Saints. And withal, it seems reasonable, that because Art and Subtilty may be used by such who seek to pervert the Catholick Doctrine, and to wrest the plain places of Scripture, which deliver it, so far from their proper meaning, that very few ordinary Capacities may be able to clear themselves of such Mists as are cast before their Eyes; the sense of the Catholick Church in succeeding Ages, may be a very useful way for us to embrace the true Sense of Scripture, especially in the great Articles of the *Christian Faith*. As for instance, in the Doctrine of the *Deity of Christ*, or the *Trinity*; though the Subtilty of such Modern Hereticks, who oppose either of these, may so far prevail on Persons, either not of sufficient judgment, or not sufficiently versed in the *Scriptures*, as at present to make them acknowledge the places are not so clear as they imagined them to be; yet they being always otherwise interpreted by the Catholick Church, or the *Christian Societies* of all Ages, lays this potent Prejudice against all such attempts, as not to believe such interpretations true, till they give a just account, why, if the belief of these Doctrines were not necessary, the *Christians* of all Ages from the *Apostles* times, did so unanimously agree in them, that when any began first to oppose them, they were declared and condemned for *Hereticks* for their pains. So that the Church of England doth very piously declare her consent with the Ancient Catholick Church, in not admitting any thing to be delivered as the sense of Scripture, which is contrary to the consent of the Catholick Church in the four first Ages. Not as though the sense of the Catholick Church were pretended to be any infallible Rule of interpreting Scripture in all things which concern the Rule of Faith; but that it is a sufficient Prescription against any thing which can be alledged out of Scripture, that if it appear contrary to the sense of the Catholick Church from the beginning, it ought not to be looked on as the true meaning of the Scripture. All this security is built upon this strong Presumption, that nothing contrary to the necessary Articles of Faith,

Faith, should be held by the *Catholick Church*, whose very Being depends upon the belief of those things which are necessary to Salvation. As long therefore as the *Church* might appear to be truly *Catholick* by those Correspondencies which were maintained between the several parts of it, that what was refused by one, was so by all; so long this unanimous and uncontradicted sense of the *Catholick Church*, ought to have a great sway upon the Minds of such who yet profess themselves Members of the *Catholick Church*. From whence it follows, that such Doctrines may well be judged destructive to the Rule of Faith, which were so unanimously condemned by the *Catholick Church* within that time. And thus much may suffice for the first Enquiry, viz. *What things are to be esteemed necessary, either in order to Salvation, or in order to Ecclesiastical Communion.*

§. 10.

2. *Whether any thing which was not necessary to Salvation, may by any means whatsoever afterwards become necessary, so that the not believing it becomes damnable, and unrepented destroys Salvation?* We suppose the Question to proceed on such things as could not antecedently to such an Act whereby they now become necessary, be esteemed to be so, either from the Matter, or from any express Command. For you in Terms assert a necessity of believing distinct from the Matter, and absolute Command, and hath the *Churches Definition* for its formal Object, which makes the necessity of our Faith continually to depend upon the *Churches Definition*; but this strange kind of *Ambulatory Faith*, I shall now shew to be repugnant to the Design of Christ and his *Apostles*, in making known Christian Religion, and to all evidence of Reason, and directly contrary to the plain and uncontradicted Sense of the *Primitive and Catholick Church*.

Isa. 11. 9.
John 6. 45.
John 4. 25.
John 15. 15.

1. It is contrary to the design of Christ and his *Apostles*, in making known the Christian Religion to the World. For, if the design of Christ was to declare whatever was necessary to the Salvation of Mankind, if the *Apostles* were sent abroad for this very end, then either they were very *unfaithful* in discharge of their trust, or else they taught *all things necessary* for their Salvation; and, if they did so, how can any thing become *necessary*, which they did never teach? Was it not the great Promise concerning the *Messias*, that at his coming, *the Earth should be full of the Knowledge of the Lord, as the Waters cover the Sea*; that then *they shall all be taught of God*? Was not this the just expectation of the People concerning him, *That when he came he would tell them all things*? Doth not he tell his Disciples, *That all things I have heard of my Father, I have made known unto you*? And, for all this, is there something still remaining necessary to Salvation, which neither he, nor his Disciples, did ever make known to the World? Doth not he promise *Life and Salvation to all such as believe and obey his Doctrine*? And can any thing be necessary for eternal Life, which he never declared? Or did he only promise it to the Men of that Age and Generation, and leave others to the Mercy of the *Churches Definitions*? If this be so, we have sad cause to lament our condition, upon whom these *heavy loyns* of the *Church* are fallen: How happy had we been, if we had lived in *Christ's*, or the *Apostles times*; for then we might have been saved, though we had never believed the *Pope's Supremacy*, or *Transubstantiation*, or *Invocation of Saints*, or *Worshipping Images*; but now the case is altered; these *Milstones* are now hung about our necks, and how we shall swim to Heaven with them, who knows? How strangely mistaken was our Saviour, when he said, *Blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed*; For, much more blessed certainly were they, who did see him, and believe in him; for then he would undertake for their Salvation; but now, it seems, we are out of his reach, and turned over to the *Merciless*

Infal-

Infallibility of the present Church. When Christ told his Disciples, *His yoke was easie, and burden light*; he little thought, what Power he had left in the Church to lay on so much load, as might cripple Men's belief; were there for a good reserve in a corner, call'd *Implicit Faith*. When he sent the Apostles to teach all that be created, he must be understood so, that the Church hath power to teach more if she pleases; and though the Apostles, poor Men, were bound up by the Commission, and St. Peter himself, yet yet his *Infallible Successors* have a *Paramount Privilege* beyond them all. Though the Spirit was promised to the Apostles, to lead them into Truth, yet there must be no incongruity, in saying, They understood not some necessary Truths (for how should they, when they were revealed) as *Transubstantiation, Supremacy, &c.* Because, though they were dreamt of such things, yet the *Infallible Church* hath done it since, for so many, and so many truth, though the Apostles Names were put on the promises, yet they were but *Feoffees* in trust for the Church, and the benefit came to the Church by them. For they were only *Tutors* to the Church, and not to be taken for some poor *Rudiments* of Christianity, as of *Images, Sacrifices, &c.* but the great and Divine Mysteries of *Grace, Redemption, &c.* which were not till the Church were at her full stand, knew long, triplum, and so on mind. When St. Paul speaks to the *Corinthians*, of things *hidden from Ages and Generations, but now made known*, it will be understood with a reference to those *silly People* who lived in that Age; but there were greater Mysteries than these, which neither Christ, nor any of his Apostles were ever acquainted with, as *Purgatory*, and those before-mentioned; for these were reserved as the Churches Portion, when her *Infallibility* should come to Age. St. Paul, honest Man, spake as he thought, when he told not the common People, but the Bishops of the Church, that he had not shunned to declare AG. 20. 27. *unto them all the Counsel of God*; but if he had lived to our Age, he would have heard of this mistake with both ears; and if he had not sworn the contrary, he must have been contented to have been call'd *Schismatic* and *Heretick* a thousand times over. These are all the just and rare consequences of your Churches blessed *Infallibility*, and power of *Teaching*, which were not so in Christ, or his Apostles times. But the matter is all is yet behind; for Men are bound to believe all the *Doctrines* of the Church to be *Apostolical* and yet that your Church hath taught things necessary to be believed, which were not so in the *Apostolical* times. For say you, *They were Doctrines then, but not so necessary as now, because they were not in the Churches Definition.* It seems, at last, the Apostles knew their own did not understand the worth of them; else, no doubt, they were such charitable Souls, they would have declared them to the World. Blessed St. Paul, who was continually employed in teaching and instructing Men in the way to Salvation, could he have held back any thing that he had heard of it, when he says, *He kept back nothing that was profitable to them, but shewed them, and taught them publicly, and from house to house, testifying to the Jews, and also to the Greeks, Repentance towards God, and Faith in our Lord Jesus Christ*: What, not one word of the necessary Points all this while? Nothing of the Church of Rome, nor Christ's Vicar on Earth, and his *Infallibility*? How sily and cunningly did St. Paul, and the rest of the Apostles carry it, if they had believed these things, never to let one word drop from their Mouths or Pens concerning them? And instead of that, speak so, and write so, that one that believes them honest, would swear they never heard of them. In what another kind of strain would St. Paul have writ

Faith, should be held by the *Catholick Church*, whose very Being depends upon the belief of those things which are necessary to Salvation. As long therefore as the *Church* might appear to be truly *Catholick* by those Correspondencies which were maintained between the several parts of it, that what was refused by one, was so by all; so long this unanimous and uncontradicted sense of the *Catholick Church*, ought to have a great sway upon the Minds of such who yet profess themselves Members of the *Catholick Church*. From whence it follows, that such Doctrines may well be judged destructive to the Rule of Faith, which were so unanimously condemned by the *Catholick Church* within that time. And thus much may suffice for the first Enquiry, viz. *What things are to be esteemed necessary, either in order to Salvation, or in order to Ecclesiastical Communion.*

§. 10.

2. *Whether any thing which was not necessary to Salvation, may by any means whatsoever afterwards become necessary, so that the not believing it becomes damnable, and unrepented destroys Salvation?* We suppose the Question to proceed on such things as could not antecedently to such an Act whereby they now become necessary, be esteemed to be so, either from the Matter, or from any expresse Command. For you in Terms assert a necessity of believing distinct from the Matter, and absolute Command, and hath the *Churches Definition* for its formal Object, which makes the necessity of our Faith continually to depend upon the *Churches Definition*; but this strange kind of *Ambulatory Faith*, I shall now shew to be repugnant to the Design of Christ and his *Apostles*, in making known Christian Religion, and to all evidence of Reason, and directly contrary to the plain and uncontradicted Sense of the *Primitive and Catholick Church*.

Is. 11. 9.
John 6.
45.
John 4 25.
John 15.
15.

1. It is contrary to the *design of Christ and his Apostles*, in making known the Christian Religion to the World. For, if the design of Christ was to declare whatever was necessary to the Salvation of Mankind, if the *Apostles* were sent abroad for this very end, then either they were very *unfaithful* in discharge of their trust, or else they taught *all things necessary* for their Salvation; and, if they did so, how can any thing become *necessary*, which they did never teach? Was it not the great Promise concerning the *Messias*, that at his coming, *the Earth should be full of the Knowledge of the Lord, as the Waters cover the Sea*; that then *they shall all be taught of God*? Was not this the just expectation of the People concerning him, *That when he came he would tell them all things*? Doth not he tell his Disciples, *That all things I have heard of my Father, I have made known unto you*? And, for all this, is there something still remaining necessary to Salvation, which neither he, nor his Disciples, did ever make known to the World? Doth not he *promise Life and Salvation to all such as believe and obey his Doctrine*? And can any thing be necessary for eternal Life, which he never declared? Or did he only promise it to the Men of that Age and Generation, and leave others to the Mercy of the *Churches Definitions*? If this be so, we have sad cause to lament our condition, upon whom these *heavy loyns* of the *Church* are fallen: How happy had we been, if we had lived in *Christ's*, or the *Apostles times*; for then we might have been saved, though we had never believed the *Pope's Supremacy*, or *Transubstantiation*, or *Invocation of Saints*, or *Worshipping Images*; but now the case is altered; these *Milstones* are now hung about our necks, and how we shall swim to Heaven with them, who knows? How strangely mistaken was our Saviour, when he said, *Blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed*; For, much more blessed certainly were they, who did see him, and believe in him; for then he would undertake for their Salvation; but now, it seems, we are out of his reach, and turned over to the *Merciless Infal-*

Infallibility of the present Church. When *Christ* told his Disciples, *His yoke was easie, and burden light*; he little thought, what *Power* he had left in the Church to lay on so much load, as might cripple Men's belief; were it not for a good reserve in a corner, call'd *Implicit Faith*. When he sent the Apostles to teach all that he commanded them, he must be understood so, that the Church hath power to teach more if she pleases; and though the Apostles, poor Men, were bound up by this Commission, and St. Peter himself too, yet his *Infallible Successors* have a *Paramount Privilege* beyond them all. Though the Spirit was promised to the Apostles, to lead them into all Truth, yet there must be no incongruity, in saying, They understood not some necessary Truths (for how should they, when never revealed) as *Transubstantiation, Supremacy, &c.* Because, though they never dreamt of such things, yet the *Infallible Church* hath done it since for them; and, to say truth, though the Apostles Names were put into the promise, yet they were but *Fooffees* in trust for the Church, and the benefit comes to the Church by them. For they were only *Tutors* to the Church in its minority, teaching it some poor Rudiments of *Christ and Heaven, of Faith and Obedience, &c.* But the great and Divine Mysteries of the *Seven Sacraments, Indulgences, Worship of Images, Sacrifice of the Mass, &c.* were not fit to be made known till the Church were at age her self, and knew how to declare her own mind. When St. Paul speaks so much of the great Mysteries bidden from Ages and Generations, but now made known, it must be understood with a reference to those silly People who lived in that Age; but there were greater Mysteries than these, which neither *Christ*, nor any of his Apostles were ever acquainted with, as *Purgatory*, and those before-mentioned; for these were reserved as the Churches Portion, when her *Infallibility* should come to Age. St. Paul, honest Man, spake as he thought, when he told not the common People, but the Bishops of the Church, That he had not shunned to declare Act. 20. 27. into them all the Counsel of God; but if he had lived to our Age, he would have heard of this mistake with both ears; and if he had not sworn the contrary, he must have been contented to have been call'd *Schismatick* and *Heretick* a thousand times over. These are all the just and rare Consequences of your Churches blessed *Infallibility*, and power of *Defining things necessary, which were not so in Christ, or his Apostles times.* But, the greatest Knack of all is yet behind; for Men are bound to believe all the Doctrines of your Church to be *Apostolical*, and yet that your Church hath power to make things necessary to be believed, which were not so in the *Apostolical times.* Yes, say you, They were Doctrines then, but not so necessary as now, because they had not the Churches Definition. It seems, at last, the Apostles knew them, but did not understand the worth of them; else, no doubt, they were such charitable Souls, they would have declared them to the World. Blessed St. Paul, who was continually employed in teaching and instructing Men in the way to Salvation, could he have held back any thing that had tended to it, when he says, *He kept back nothing that was profitable to them, but shewed them, and taught them publicly, and from house to house, testifying to the Jews, and also to the Greeks, Repentance towards God, and Faith in our Lord Jesus Christ:* What, not one word of the necessary Points all this while? Nothing of the Church of Rome, nor *Christ's Vicar on Earth*, and his *Infallibility*? How sily and cunningly did St. Paul, and the rest of the Apostles carry it, if they had believed these things, never to let one word drop from their Mouths or Pens concerning them? And instead of that, speak so, and write so, that one that believes them honest, would swear they never heard of them. In what another kind of strain would St. Paul have writ Act. 20. 20, 21.

to the Church of Rome, if he had had but any inkling of the *Chair of Infallibility*, being placed there? How soon would he have blotted out the whole 14th Chapter of his Epistle to the *Corinthians*, if he had known his Holiness his pleasure about *serving God in an unknown Tongue*? How well might he have spared saying, *That a Bishop should be the Husband of one Wife*, if he had known *de jure divino* he must have none at all? At what another rate would he have discoursed of the *Eucharist*, had he believed *Transubstantiation*, *Sacrifice of the Mass*, *Communion under one kind*? What course would he have taken with the *Schismatical Corinthians*, that were divided like other Churches, if he had known the *Infallible Judge of Controversie*? If he had but understood the danger of *reading Scriptures*, he might have spared his Exhortations to the People of the Word of God *dwelling richly in them*, and filled his Epistles with *Pater Nosters*, and *Ave Mary's*, or given good directions about them. But he must be pardoned, he was ignorant of these things as well as we: Only St. Paul never heard of them, and we do not believe them; because neither he, nor his Brethren ever revealed them to us, though they were the *Stewards of the Mysteries of God*; and they tell us themselves, *That it is requisite such should be faithful*, which we cannot understand how they could be, if they knew these deep Mysteries, but never discovered them that we can learn. But, if they knew them not, I pray from whence is it your Church learns them? By *immediate Inspiration*? No, as bold as you are, you dare not challenge that: But whence then come you to know them to be necessary? *infallibly forsooth*: But whence comes this *Infallibility*? Must there not be a *peculiar Revelation*, to discover that to be necessary, which was never discovered to be so before? But if discovered before, and declared before, the things were as necessary before your Churches Definition, as after; and therefore your Churches Definition adds nothing of necessity to them. If *neither discovered, nor declared*, you must have particular Revelation for them, and then *work Miracles*, and we will believe you, but not otherwise; but, before you do it, consider what St. Paul hath said concerning an *Angel from Heaven Preaching another Gospel*, *let him be accursed*; and what can be more *Preaching another Gospel*, than making other things necessary to Salvation, than Christ or his Apostles did? and think then what your Church hath deserved for all her Definitions concerning *Articles of Faith*, or things necessary to be believed in order to Salvation. But yet further you say, *That these things were declared by the Apostles, but they need a further Declaration now*: And why so? Shew us the *Apostle's Declaration*, and it sufficeth us; we shall not believe them one jot the more for your additional Definition. And it is surely a sign, you did not think the *Apostles Declaration* sufficient, or else you would never pretend to new ones. Perhaps you will tell us, *It was to their Age, but not to ours*? Why not, as well as the other necessary *Articles of Faith* contained in Scripture? I know your Answer is, *We can know no necessary Article of Faith at all; but from your Church*. So then, we have brought all into a narrow compass, and instead of new Definitions of the Church concerning necessary things, we can know nothing at all to be necessary to be believed, but from your Church. This is high, but the higher it is, the better Foundation it had need stand on, which we shall thoroughly search into, in the Controversie of the resolution of Faith: To which we refer it, and return. If there were once a Declaration, but still there needs another, What is become of that Declaration? Was it lost in its passage down to us? How then was that present Church *Infallible*, which lost a Declaration in Matter of Faith? Was it necessary to be believed in the

the intermediate Age or no? If it was, then it was not *lost*, and then what need a new *Declaration*? If not, then a thing once *necessary* to *Salvation*, may be *not necessary* to *Salvation*; and become *necessary* to *Salvation* again. But still we have cause to envy their Happiness, who lived in the Age when they might be saved without believing these things: For the case goes hard with us, for you tell us, Unless we believe them necessary, we cannot be saved; and our Consciences tell us, that if we did profess to believe them necessary, when we do not, and cannot, we cannot be saved. What a case then were we in, if the Pope were *Christ's Vicar* in *Heaven*, as he pretends to be on *Earth*? but it is our comfort, he is neither so, nor so. Thus we see what Repugnancy there is both to *Scripture* and *Reason* in this strange Doctrine of your Churches Definitions making things *necessary* to *Salvation*, which were not so before.

I should now proceed to shew how repugnant this Doctrine is to the unanimous consent of *Antiquity*; but I find my self prevented in that, by the late *Writings* of one of your own *Communion*; and if you will believe him in his *Epistle Dedicatory* (which I much question) the present Pope's most humble *Servant*, our Countryman Mr. *Thomas White*. Whose whole Book, call'd his *Tabula Suffragiales*, is purposely designed against this fond and absurd Opinion; nay, he goes so high, as to assert the Opinion of the Pope's *Personal Infallibility*, not only to be *Heretical*, but *Archi-heretical*; and that the propagating of this Doctrine is in its kind a most grievous Sin. It cannot but much rejoice us to see, that Men of Wit and Parts begin to discover the intolerable Arrogance of such Pretences, and that such Men as Dr. *Holden*, and Mr. *White*, are in many things come so near the *Protestant Principles*; and that since they quit the *Plea of Infallibility*, and rely on *Universal Tradition*, we are in hopes that the same Reason and Ingenuity which carried these Persons thus far, will carry others, who go on the same Principles, so much farther, as to see, how impossible it is to make good the Points in *Controversie* between us, upon the *Principle of Universal Tradition*. Which the *Bigots* of your Church are sufficiently sensible of, and therefore like the *Man at Athens*, when your *Hands* are cut off, you are resolved to hold this *Infallibility* with your *Teeth*: And so that Gentleman finds by the proceedings of the Court of *Rome* against him for that and his other pieces. But, this should not have been taken notice of, lest we should seem to see (as who doth not, that is not stark blind?) What growing Divisions and *Animosities* there are among your selves both at home, and in foreign Parts; and yet all this while the poor silly People must be told, that there is nothing but *Divisio*n out of your Church, and nothing but *Harmony* and *Musick* in it, but such as is made of *Discords*. And that about this present Controversie; for the forenamed Gentleman in his *Epistle* to the present Pope, tells him plainly, That it is found true by frequent Experience, that there is no defending the *Catholick Faith* against the *Subtilties* of his *Heretical Countrymen*, without the *Principles* of that Book, which was condemned at *Rome*. And what those Principles are, we may easily see by this Book, which is writ in defence of the former. Wherein he largely proves, that the Church hath no power to make *New Articles of Faith*, which he proves both from *Scripture*, *Reason* and *Authority*; this last, is that I shall refer the Reader to him for: For in his second Table, as he calls it, he proves from the Testimonies of *Origen*, *Basil*, *Chrysostom*, *Cyril*, *Irenaeus*, *Tertullian*, *Pope Stephen*, *Hierom*, *Theophylact*, *Augustine*, *Vincentius Lerinensis*, and several others; nay, the

5. 11.

Tabula suff.
cap. 19,
20, 21.

Neq. si complurium experimentis fidem habere liceat, adversus nostratum haereticorum subtilitates fides Catholica sustineri potest absq. praecipuis hujus libelli dogmatibus, & (si conicere fas sit) aliquibus accusatis. Tabula suffrag. ep. dedicat. ad Papam Alex. 7.

Tabula suff.
frag. tab.
2. p. 11, &c.

Testi-

Testimonies, he says, to this purpose, are so many, that whole *Libraries* must be transcribed to produce them all. And afterwards more largely proves, That the Faith of the Church lies in a continued succession from the *Apostles*, both from *Scripture* and *Reason*, and abundance of *Church Authorities* in his 4, 5, and 6 *Tables*: And, through the rest of his Book disproves the *Infallibility of Councils and Pope*. And, can you think all this is answered by an *Index Expurgatorius*, or by publishing a *false Latin Order* of the *Inquisition* at *Rome*, whereby his Books are prohibited, and his *Opinions* condemned as *Heretical, Erroneous in Faith, Rash, Scandalous, Seditious*, and what not? It seems then, it is grown at last *de fide*, that the

V. exemplat ipsius Decreti apud Tho. Albii purgat. p. 9.

Eminentissimos Praefules, infortunio praesentis seculi, in quo scientia ex Scholis exulat, & fidei & Theologiae veritates numero votorum astimantur, incidisse in Consultores ex majori parte & ignaros & arrogantes, qui intrepide configant propositiones, quas jurati asserant se nescire, sint ne verae vel falsae. Appendix Albiana ad Purgat. lect. postier. p. 212. A. D. 1662.

Pope is Infallible, and never more like to do so, than in this Age; for the same Person gives us this Character of it in his Purgation of himself, to the *Cardinals* of the *Inquisition*, saying, *That their Eminencies, by the unhappiness of the present Age, in which Knowledge is banished out of the Schools, and the Doctrines of Faith and Theological Truths are judged by most Voices; fell, it seems, upon some ignorant and arrogant Consultors; who, hand over head, condemn those Propositions, which upon their Oaths, they could not tell whether they were true or false.* If these be your Proceedings at *Rome*, happy

we that have nothing to do with such *Infallible Ignorance*: This is the Age your Religion were like to thrive in, if *Ignorance* were as predominant elsewhere, as it seems it is at *Rome*. But I leave this, and return.

- S. 12. 3. The last thing is, *Whether the Church hath Power by any Proposition or Definition, to make any thing become necessary to Salvation, and to be believed as such which was not so before?* But this is already answered by the foregoing Discourse; for if the necessity of the things to be believed, must be supposed antecedently to the *Churches Being*, if that which was not before necessary, cannot by any Act whatsoever afterwards become necessary, then it unavoidably follows, That the Church neither hath, nor can have any such Power. Other things which relate to this, we shall have occasion to discuss in following your Steps: Which having thus far cleared this important Controversie, I betake my self to.

And we are highly obliged to you, for the rare Divertisements you give us in your excellent way of managing Controversies. Had my Lord of *Canterbury* been living, What an excellent entertainment would your Confutation of his Book have afforded him? But, since so pleasant a Province is fallen to my share, I must learn to command my self in the management of it, and therefore, where you present us with any thing which deserves a serious Answer, for Truth and the Causes sake, you shall be sure to have it. In the first place, you charge his Lordship with a Fallacy, and that is, because, when he was to speak of Fundamentals, he did not speak of that which was not Fundamental. But, say you, *He turns the Difficulty, which only proceeded upon a Fundamentality or Necessity, derived from the formal Object, that is, from the Divine Authority revealing that Point, to the Material Object, that is, to the importance of the Matter contained in the Point revealed; which is a plain Fallacy, in passing à sensu formali ad materialem.* Men seldom suspect those Faults in others, which they find not strong Inclinations to in themselves; had you not been conscious of a notorious Fallacy in this distinction of *Formal and Material Object*, as here applied by you; you would never have suspected any such *Sophistry* in his Lordship's Discourse. I pray consider what kind of *Fundamentals* those are, which the

P. 15. n. 4.

Question

Question proceeds on, viz. such as are necessary to be owned as such by all Churches, in order to their being true Churches, as is plain by the rise of this Controversie; for Mr. Fisher was proving the Greek Church to be no true Church, and, in order to that, proves, that she erred Fundamentally, for which he makes use of this Medium; That, whatever is defined by the Church is Fundamental. So that the whole Process of the Dispute lies thus. Whatever Church is guilty of a Fundamental Error, ceaseth to be a true Church; but the Greek Church is guilty of a Fundamental Error; ergo The Minor being denied, he thus proves it: If whatever is defined by the Church be Fundamental, then the Greek Church is guilty of a Fundamental Error, because she denies something defined by the Church; but whatever is defined by the Church is Fundamental; which is the thing his Lordship denies, and his Adversary is bound to prove. So that any one who was not resolved to wink as hard as you do, might easily see, the State of the Controversie doth not concern what things are Fundamental, supposing Men know them to be sufficiently propounded; but what things are so necessary to be owned for Fundamentals, that upon the denying them, a Church ceaseth to be a true Church. Yet this mistake, as gross and palpable as it is, runs through your whole Discourse of Fundamentals, which, without it, cannot hold together. If you will therefore prove, that, besides such things whose necessity ariseth from the Matter, there are other from the Formal Object, which all Churches are equally bound to believe, in order to their being true Churches, you do something; but not before.

But we must still attend your Motions, especially when they tend towards Proofs, as yours do now. For, say you, Now I shew (the difficulty being understood, as it ought to be of the Formal Object, whereby Points of Faith are manifested to Christians) that all Points defined by the Church as Matter of Faith, are Fundamental; that is, necessary to Salvation to be believed, by all those to whom they are sufficiently propounded to be so defined by this Argument. Whosoever refuseth to believe any thing sufficiently propounded to him for a Truth revealed from God, commits a Sin damnable and destructive of Salvation: But, whosoever refuses to believe any Point sufficiently propounded to him for defined by the Church as Matter of Faith, refuses to believe a thing sufficiently propounded to him for a Truth revealed from God. Ergo, Whosoever refuses to believe any Point sufficiently propounded to him for defined by the Church as Matter of Faith, commits a Sin damnable and destructive of Salvation. Before you proceed to the Proof of your Minor, several things must here be considered, that we may better understand your meaning, and know what it is you intend to prove. Especially what you intend by sufficient Proposition. Do you mean such a Proposition as carries Evidence along with it, or not? In which case the very understanding the Terms, is sufficient Proposition, as that, two and two make four; but, I suppose, you mean not this, therefore it must be the sufficient Proposition of something which wants natural Evidence; and therefore something else must be required, besides the propounding the thing, to make the Proposition be said to be sufficient. For Sufficiency relates to some End; so that a sufficient Proposition must be such a Proposition as is sufficient for its End: Now the end of the Proposition of Matters of Faith, is, that they may be believed; and therefore the sufficiency of the Proposition lies in the Arguments or Motives inducing Men to believe. Now the Objects of Faith being of a different nature, the Sufficiency of the Proposition must be taken from a respect to them: For in things which are so clearly revealed, as necessary to Salvation, that none who acknowledge the Scripture to be God's Word, can

Testimonies, he says, to this purpose, are so many, that whole *Libraries* must be transcribed to produce them all. And afterwards more largely proves, That the Faith of the Church lies in a continued succession from the *Apostles*, both from *Scripture* and *Reason*, and abundance of *Church Authorities* in his 4, 5, and 6 *Tables*: And, through the rest of his Book disproves the *Infallibility of Councils and Pope*. And, can you think all this is answered by an *Index Expurgatorius*, or by publishing a *false Latin Order of the Inquisition at Rome*, whereby the Books are prohibited, and his Opinions condemned as Heretical, Erroneous in Faith, Scandalous, Seditious, and what not? It seems then, it is grown to such a degree, that the

V. exemplat ipsius Decretum apud Tho. Albi purgat. p. 9.

Eminentissimos Presules, in hoc seculo præfatis seculi, in quo scientia ex Scholis exaltatur, & fidei & Theologiae veritates magis innotuerunt, affirmantur, in illis in quibus ex maiori parte ex ignorantia, et non ex malicia, qui inspicere, autem, præfatis, qui jurati asserunt se necesse, non est, et non falsa. Appendix Almanac ad Purgat. lect. postea, p. 212. A. D. 1683.

Pope is infallible, and never more like to do so, than in this Age: for the same Person gives us this Character of himself, to the *Cardinals* of the *Inquisition*, that their *Companies*, by the *union of the present Age*, in which *Knowledge* is *spread out*, and the *Doctrines of Faith* are *judged by most Voices*, tell it to the *most famous* and *most Consultors*; who, *and over* those *Propositions*, which upon their *Oath*, they *could not tell whether they were true or false*. Hence the *Proceedings at Rome*, happy

we that have nothing to do with such *infallible Ignorance*: This is the Age your Religion were like to thrive in, if Ignorance were as predominant elsewhere, as it seems it is at *Rome*. But I leave this, and return.

§. 11. 3. The last thing is, Whether the Church hath Power by any Proposition or Definition, to make any thing become necessary to Salvation, and to be believed as such which was not so before? But this is already answered by the foregoing Discourse; for if the necessity of the things to be believed, must be supposed antecedently to the Churches Being, if that which was not before necessary, cannot by any Act whatsoever afterwards become necessary, then it unavoidably follows, That the Church neither hath, nor can have any such Power. Other things which relate to this, we shall have occasion to discuss in following your Steps: Which having thus far cleared this important Controversie, I betake my self to.

And we are highly obliged to you, for the rare Divertisements you give us in your excellent way of managing Controversies. Had my Lord of *Cantabrigia* been living, what an excellent entertainment would your Confutation of his Book have afforded him? But, since so pleasant a Province is fallen to my share, I must learn to command my self in the management of it, and therefore, where you present us with any thing which deserves a serious Answer, for Truth and the Causes sake, you shall be sure to have it. In the first place, you charge his Lordship with a Fallacy, and that is, because, when he was to speak of Fundamentals, he did not speak of that which was not Fundamental. But, say you, He turns the Difficulty, which only proceeded upon a Fundamentality or Necessity, derived from the formal Object, that is, from the Divine Authority revealing that Point, to the Material Object, that is, to the importance of the Matter contained in the Point revealed; which is a plain Fallacy, in passing à sensu formali ad materialem. Men seldom suspect those Faults in others, which they find not strong Inclinations to in themselves; had you not been conscious of a notorious Fallacy in this distinction of Formal and Material Object, as here applied by you; you would never have suspected any such Sophistry in his Lordship's Discourse. I pray consider what kind of Fundamentals those are, which the

Question

Question proceeds on, viz. such as are necessary to be owned as such by all Churches, in order to their being true Churches, as is plain by the rise of this Controversie; for Mr. Fisher was proving the Greek Church to be no true Church, and, in order to that, proves, that she erred Fundamentally, for which he makes use of this Medium; That, whatever is defined by the Church is Fundamental. So that the whole Process of the Dispute lies thus. Whatever Church is guilty of a Fundamental Error, ceaseth to be a true Church; but the Greek Church is guilty of a Fundamental Error; ergo The Minor being denied, he thus proves it: If whatever is defined by the Church be Fundamental, then the Greek Church is guilty of a Fundamental Error, because she denies something defined by the Church; but whatever is defined by the Church is Fundamental; which is the thing his Lordship denies, and his Adversary is bound to prove. So that any one who was not resolved to wink as hard as you do, might easily see, the State of the Controversie doth not concern what things are Fundamental, supposing Men know them to be sufficiently propounded; but what things are so necessary to be owned for Fundamentals, that upon the denying them, a Church ceaseth to be a true Church. Yet this mistake, as gross and palpable as it is, runs through your whole Discourse of Fundamentals, which, without it, cannot hold together. If you will therefore prove, that, besides such things whose necessity ariseth from the Matter, there are other from the Formal Object, which all Churches are equally bound to believe, in order to their being true Churches, you do something; but not before.

But we must still attend your Motions, especially when they tend towards Proofs, as yours do now. For, say you, Now I shew (the difficulty being understood, as it ought to be of the Formal Object, whereby Points of Faith are manifested to Christians) that all Points defined by the Church as Matter of Faith, are Fundamental; that is, necessary to Salvation to be believed, by all those to whom they are sufficiently propounded to be so defined by this Argument. Whosoever refuseth to believe any thing sufficiently propounded to him for a Truth revealed from God, commits a Sin damnable and destructive of Salvation: But, whosoever refuses to believe any Point sufficiently propounded to him for defined by the Church as Matter of Faith, refuses to believe a thing sufficiently propounded to him for a Truth revealed from God. Ergo, Whosoever refuses to believe any Point sufficiently propounded to him for defined by the Church as Matter of Faith, commits a Sin damnable and destructive of Salvation. Before you proceed to the Proof of your Minor, several things must here be considered, that we may better understand your meaning, and know what it is you intend to prove. Especially what you intend by sufficient Proposition. Do you mean such a Proposition as carries Evidence along with it, or not? In which case the very understanding the Terms, is sufficient Proposition, as that, two and two make four; but, I suppose, you mean not this, therefore it must be the sufficient Proposition of something which wants natural Evidence; and therefore something else must be required, besides the propounding the thing, to make the Proposition be said to be sufficient. For Sufficiency relates to some End; so that a sufficient Proposition must be such a Proposition as is sufficient for its End: Now the end of the Proposition of Matters of Faith, is, that they may be believed; and therefore the sufficiency of the Proposition lies in the Arguments or Motives inducing Men to believe. Now the Objects of Faith being of a different nature, the Sufficiency of the Proposition must be taken from a respect to them: For in things which are so clearly revealed, as necessary to Salvation, that none who acknowledge the Scripture to be God's Word, can

can doubt but such things are necessary ; in this case the *Sufficiency* of the *Proposition* lies in the *Evidence* of *Divine Revelation*, and the clearness of it to all Understandings who consider it, and the *Reasons* or *Motives* of Faith in that case, are the same with those which induce Men to believe, that the *Scripture it self is from Divine Revelation*. But there being other things in *Scripture*, which neither appear so clear, or so necessary to be believed by all, something else is required in order to a *sufficient Proposition* of them, and in order to the making any of these things universally obligatory to *Christians* on pain of Damnation, for not believing them, these things are necessary. 1. It must be *much clearer* than the thing which is propounded to be believed on the account of it ; for, to propound a thing to be believed by something at least as disputable as the matter it self, cannot certainly be called a *sufficient Proposition*. 2. It must be *antecedently proved* to be a true and certain Proposition, before any thing can be believed on the account of it. For, if Men cannot see any reason to believe that there is any *necessary Connexion* between that which you call a sufficient Proposition, and any Matter of Faith ; they cannot be guilty of any Sin at all in not believing what you think is sufficiently propounded. But, in this case, it is not your judgment, what *Proposition* is sufficient that makes it so, but the *Reason* of the *Thing*, and the *Evidence* that *God* hath appointed that way to reveal his Will to Men, and that what is so propounded is necessary to be believed. As for instance, suppose you were told by the *Greek Church*, that to believe the *Pope's Supremacy, jure divino*, were a damnable Sin, and that whosoever did not believe this being sufficiently propounded to them as a Matter of Faith, as defined by the *Church*, were guilty of a Sin destructive to Salvation, what answer would you return in this case ? Would you not say, That the *Proposition*, though judged *sufficient* by them, is not judged so by you ; and that they must first prove, that whatever their *Church defines* as a Matter of Faith, is to be believed for such, before the other can be believed on the account of it ? Just the same Answer we return to you ; prove first of all to us in a clear and evident manner, that *God* hath appointed the *Definition* of your *Church*, as the means whereby we may be infallibly *assured*, what is *Matter of Faith*, and what not ; and then we may grant, that what your *Church* propounds as a Matter of Faith, is sufficiently propounded as a Matter revealed from *God*, but not before. For, while I see no reason to believe the *Churches Proposition* to be *sufficient*, I have no reason to believe, that what she propounds, as defined for Matter of Faith, is truly so : And, as long as I can see no reason to believe it, prove the disbelief of it to be a Sin in me when you can. Thus we see how far from being evident that *Major* of yours is, though you are pleased to tell us, it is so ; but we do not believe your *Defining* it to be so, to be *any Matter of Faith*, unless we had better reason for it than we have. For, say you, *To refuse to believe God's Revelation, is either to give God the Lye, or to doubt whether he speak Truth or no ?* But, have you so little wit, as not to distinguish between *not believing God's Revelation*, and *not believing what is propounded for God's Revelation ?* Must every one, who doth not believe every thing that is propounded for *God's Revelation*, presently give *God the Lye*, and *doubt whether he speak Truth or no ?* And are not you then guilty of that fault every time a *Quaker* or *Enthusiast* tells you, That the *Spirit of God within him told him this and that ?* But you said, *Sufficiently propounded*. But the Question is, What *sufficient Proposition* is, and who must be Judge whether the Proposition be sufficient or no, you, or the Conscience of the Person to whom the thing is proposed

to be believed? If any one indeed that judgeth a Proposition sufficient, do notwithstanding question the *truth* of it, he doth interpretatively call *God's Veracity* into question; but not he certainly who thinks not *God's Veracity* at all concerned in that which you call a sufficient Proposition; but he judgeth not to be so.

Let us now see, how you prove your *Assumption*, which is very fairly done from a Supposition which his Lordship denies; which is, *That General Councils cannot err*. But, say you, he adds, *That though he should grant it, yet this cannot down with him, that all Points even so defined were Fundamentals*. I grant, those are his Words, and his Reasons follow them. For, *Deductions are not prime and native Principles; nor are Superstructures, Foundations. That which is a Foundation for all, cannot be one and another to different Christians, in regard of it self; for then it could be no common Rule for any, nor could the Souls of Men rest upon a shaking Foundation*. No, if it be a true Foundation, it must be common to all, and firm under all; in which sense the Articles of Christian Faith are Fundamental. What now do you prove to destroy this? You very strenuously prove, That if Men believe, a General Council cannot err, they believe it cannot err so far, and no further than it cannot err. But, if you mean any thing further, your meaning is better than your proof: For when you would prove that to *disbelieve the Churches Definition, is to disbelieve God's Revelation*; and in order to that confound the Church and General Councils together, and from the General Council's not erring, infer the former Proposition, because, *what is testified by the Church, is testified by an Authority that cannot err*; you do not consider, that all this while you prove nothing against his Lordship, unless you first prove, that whatever is testified to be revealed from God, is presently Fundamental to all Churches and Christians, which his Lordship utterly denies, by distinguishing even things which may be testified to be revealed from God, into such things as are common to all Christians to be believed by them, and such things as vary according to the different respects of Christians. But yet further, I add, that taking Fundamentals in your sense, you prove not the thing you intended, but only to such as do acknowledge, and as far as they do acknowledge, that General Councils cannot err. For, they who acknowledge them infallible only in Fundamentals, do not judge any thing Fundamental by their Decision, but judge their Decisions infallible, so long as they hold to Fundamentals; and so (for all that I can see) leave themselves Judges, when General Councils are infallible, and when not: And therefore if they go about to testify any thing as revealed from God, which is not Fundamental, they do not believe that their Testimony cannot err, and so are not bound to believe that it is from God. They who believe General Councils absolutely Infallible, I do verily think do believe General Councils infallible in all they say; for that is the substance of all you say. But, what that is to those who neither do, nor can see any reason to believe them infallible in all they say or testify as revealed from God, I neither do, nor can possibly understand. And, if you hope such kind of Arguments can satisfy your ingenuous Reader, you suppose him a good natur'd Man in the Greek sense of the Phrase.

But all of a sudden, we find you in a very generous strain, and are contented to take Fundamentals for Fundamentals (which is a huge Concession, and his Lordship, were he living, would take it for a singular favour from you.) Yet to deal freely with the Bishop (say you) even taking Fundamentals in a general way (as it ought to be taken only here) for a thing belonging to the Foundation of Religion (and it is a strange Fundamental

which hath no respect to the Foundation, but they who build downwards, must have their Foundations on the tops of their Houses.) It is also manifest, that all Points defined by the Church are Fundamental, by reason of that formal Object, or infallible Authority, propounding them, though not always by reason of the matter which they contain. The main proof of which lies in this, P. 16, 17. That he who doth not believe the Church infallible, can believe nothing at all infallibly, and therefore no Fundamental of Religion; but, if he believe any thing upon the Churches Infallibility, he must believe all things on the same account of her Infallibility, and therefore must believe all equally; and so, whatever is propounded by the Church, is to be believed as Fundamental. This you cannot deny to be the force and strength of your verbose, and confused way of arguing. And therefore I give you a short Answer, That I utterly deny the Infallibility of any Church, to be in any thing the Foundation of Divine and Infallible Faith; as you will find it abundantly proved in the proper place for it, in the Controversie of the Resolution of Faith. Where it will be largely discussed, in what sense Faith may be said to be Divine and Infallible, what the proper Grounds and Reasons of our believing are, and how much you impose upon the World, in pretending that the Resolution of Faith, is into the Catholick Churches Infallibility; whereby it will appear to be far from a Fundamental Error, not to believe on the Churches Infallibility, and that he who denies it, will have no reason to call into Question the Canon of Scripture, or the Foundations of all Religion. But, that you rather, by these absurd and unreasonable Pretences of yours, have done your utmost to shake the true Foundations of Religion, and advance nothing but Scepticism, not to say Atheism in the World. These things I take upon me to make good in their proper place, and therefore shall not enter the discussion of them here: But since, this is the main, and, in truth, the only Foundation of your Doctrine of Fundamentals, the Vanity, Falshood and Absurdity of it, cannot be sufficiently understood, till we have gone through the Account of the Grounds of Faith.

If St. Augustine make some no Catholick Christians, for holding obstinately some things of no great moment in his Book of Heresies; it was, because by Catholick Christians he understood all such, and only such, as were the Members of the sound and Orthodox Church, in opposition to all kind of unnecessary separation from it upon matters of small moment, and not because he believed the Churches Infallibility, in defining all Matters of Faith; and that all such things were so defined, which Men are called Hereticks for denying of: Unless you will suppose, it was ever infallibly defined, that there were no Antipodes; for some were accounted Hereticks for believing them; and that by such whom you account greater than St. Austin. But, for St. Austin, how far it was from his meaning, to have all those accounted Fundamental Errors, which he recounts in his Book of Heresies, appears not only from the multitude of particulars mentioned in it, which no one in his senses can acknowledge Fundamental, or declared by the Church as necessary to be believed by all, but from his declared scope and design in the Preface to that Book, wherein it appears, he was desired not only to write the greater Errors concerning Faith, the Trinity, Baptism, Repentance, Christ, the Resurrection, the Old and New Testament, *Sed omnia omnino quibus à veritate dissentiunt*, i. e. all kind of Errors whatsoever; and do you think that there could then be no Error, but it must be against something then defined by the Church as necessary to Salvation? If not, then all Truths were then defined by the Church, and consequently there could be no new Definitions ever since; if there might, then those Errors mentioned by St. Austin, were

were not about Matters necessary to be believed ; and so St. *Austin's* Book of *Heresies* makes nothing for you ; but very much against you, considering that in all that Black List of *Hereticks*, there are none brought in for denying those grand *Fundamentals* of your Church, the *Pope's* Supremacy, your Churches *Infallibility*, nor any of that new brood of necessary Articles, which were so prudently hatcht by the Council of Trent. But if St. *Austin* do you no good, you hope St. *Gregory Nazianzen* may, because he saith, *That nothing can be more perillous than those Hereticks, who with a drop of Poison do infect our Lord's sincere Faith.* Therefore all things defined by the Church are *Fundamental*. What an excellent Art this *Logick* is, that can fetch out of things that which was never in them ! What a rare Consequence is this, *If Heresie be dangerous*, then, whatever is defined by the Church, is *Fundamental* : But it may be, the strength lies in the drop of Poison, as though St. *Gregory* thought a drop of Poison as dangerous as a whole Dose of it. But, were I your *Physician*, instead of the least drop of Poison, I should prescribe you good store of *Hellebore*, and should hope to see the effect of it, in making better Consequences than these are. But to see yet further, the strange effects that *Logick* hath upon some Men ; for, say you, in the Prosecution of your Proof, that all things defined by the Church are *Fundamental*. Hence it is, that *Christ our Saviour* saith, *Matth. 8. 17.* *If he will not hear the Church, let him be to thee as a Heathen and a Publican.* The Argument in form runs thus ; Whosoever deserves Excommunication, is guilty of a *Fundamental Error* ; but he that will not hear the Church, deserves Excommunication ; ergo, Or else there may be more in it than so. For, no doubt, the *Heathens and Publicans* as such, were guilty of *Fundamental Errors* ; therefore they who will not hear the Church, are guilty of as *Fundamental Errors* as *Heathens and Publicans*. But, before you urge us any more with this dreadful Argument, I pray tell us, What that Church is which our Saviour speaks of ; what the cases are, wherein the Church is to be heard ; what the full importance is, of being as a *Heathen and Publican* ; and you must prove this Church to be understood in your sense of the *Catholick Church*, and that this Church hath hereby Power to define Matters of Faith, and that none can possibly in any other sense be accounted as *Heathens and Publicans*, but as guilty of as *Fundamental Errors* as they were.

Your next Objection concerning giving God and the Church the Lye, and preferring and opposing a Man's private judgment and Will before and against the Judgment and Will of God and the Church, if Men deny or doubt of any thing made known by the Church to be a Truth revealed by God ; signifies nothing at all, unless it be antecedently proved, that the Church can never err in declaring any thing to be a Truth revealed by God, which none, who know what you mean by the Church, will easily assent to, till you have attempted a further Proof of it, than yet we find. And, although the questioning Divine Veracity be destructive to that which you call *Supernatural Faith*, yet I hope it is possible to believe God to be true, and yet that all Men are lyars, or that there is no such inseparable Connexion between God's Veracity, and the present Declarations of any Church, but that one may heartily assent to the former, and yet question the truth of the latter. If you think otherwise, shew your Pity to the Weakness of our Understandings, by something that may look like a proof of it, which we are still much to seek for.

S. 14.
P. 18.

But, your greatest strength, like *Sampson's*, seems to lie there where one would least suspect it, viz. in *Athanasius his Creed*. For thus you go on. Wherefore it is said in *St. Athanasius his Creed* (which is approved in the thirty nine Articles of the pretended English Church) that, *Whosoever will be saved, it is necessary that he hold the Catholick Faith*—which unless every one hold whole and inviolate, without doubt he shall perish for ever: Neither can the Bishop reply, That all Points expressed therein are Fundamental in his Sense; for (to omit the Article of our Saviour's Descent into Hell) he mentions expressly the Procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father and the Son, which his Lordship hath denied to be a Fundamental Point, as we saw in the former Chapter. But, the better to comprehend the Force of this Argument, we must first consider what it is you intend to prove by it, and then in what way and manner you prove it from this Creed. The matter which you are to prove, is, that all things defined by the Church are Fundamental, i. e. in your Sense necessary to Salvation; and, that the ground why such things, whose matter is not necessary, do become necessary, is, because the Church declares them to be revealed by God; now, in order to this, you insist upon the Creed, commonly call'd *Athanasius his*, wherein some things, acknowledged not to be Fundamental in the matter, are yet said to be necessary to Salvation, and that this is owned by the Church of England. This is the substance of the Argument, which being resolved into its parts, will consist of these Propositions. 1. That some things owned not to be Fundamental in the Matter, are yet acknowledged in the Creed of *Athanasius*, to be necessary to Salvation. 2. That the reason why these things do become necessary, is, because the Church hath defined them to be so. 3. That this is acknowledged by the Church of England. And therefore, by parity of Reason, whatever is defined by the Church, must be necessary to Salvation. But every one of these Propositions being ambiguous, the clear stating of them will be the best way of solving the Difficulty, which seems to lie in the present Argument. And the main Ambiguity lies in the meaning of that necessity to Salvation, which is implied in the *Athanasian Creed*, as to the Articles therein contained; for, there being different Grounds and Reasons upon which things may be supposed necessary, there can be no just Consequence made from the general owning a necessity of the Belief of some things, to the making those things necessary to be believed upon one particular account of it. For the necessity of believing things to Salvation, may arise from one of these three Grounds. 1. The Supposition, that the Matter to be believed is in it self necessary, this makes it necessary to all those Persons who are of that Perswasion; and on this Ground it is plain, that the main Articles of the *Athanasian Creed* are generally supposed necessary, viz. those concerning the Trinity in Unity, the Incarnation, Resurrection, and Eternal Life, &c. Now these being supposed to be necessary from the Matter, any Church may own them under this degree of necessity, in that expression used in several places of the *Athanasian Creed*, *Whosoever will be saved, it is necessary that he hold the Catholick Faith*—which Catholick Faith is, &c. But then we are to consider, that this is only a Declaration of the sense of that Church, what things she owns as necessary, and what not. And this Declaration doth not oblige the Conscience of particular Persons any further, than as the Articles of that Church are required to be owned as the Conditions of Communion with her, i. e. where the degree of necessity is not declared, nor expressly owned by a Church, but left in general Terms; no Man is bound to believe the things judged as necessary, with any particular kind of necessity exclusive of others, but

but only that the *Church in General* may use that *Creed* supposed necessary, and that the Use of that *Creed* is a lawful Condition of that *Churches Communion*. 2. The belief of a thing may be supposed necessary, because of the clear *Conviction* of Men's Understandings, that though the Matters be not in themselves necessary, yet being *revealed by God*, they must be explicitly believed; but then the necessity of this Belief doth extend no further than the clearness of that *Conviction* doth. As, suppose it inserted into a *Creed*, that the Article of the *Descent* must be understood according to the sense of the *Scriptures*, this doth oblige no Man to any further necessity of belief of the sense of the Article, than he is convinced, that it is the sense of the *Scriptures*: And the case is the same, when the Article is expressed only in general Terms, which are known to be capable of very different senses, when none of which are expressed, no particular sense can be said to be necessary to Salvation, to particular Persons, but only that sense in general, which all must agree in who own it, and the particulars are left to the *Convictions* of Men's Understandings upon the use of the best Means of Satisfaction. So that he that believes fully that the meaning of this Article from *Scripture*, is, that *Christ's Soul* did locally descend to Hell, it is necessary for him to believe so, upon such *Conviction*; but he that sees no more necessary to be believed by it, but that *Christ's Soul* was, during his Body's lying in the Grave, in a *State of Separation* from it; how can you prove it necessary to Salvation for him to believe any more than this? And the case is the same as to all *Modes of Existence*, and particular Explications of Articles in themselves owned, as of the different *Subsistences in the Trinity*, the manner of the *Hypostatical Union* of the two Natures in *Christ's Person*, supposing the Doctrines themselves believed, what reason can there be to assert it necessary to Salvation to all Persons, to believe them under such a sense, if the Article may be it self believed without it, any further than as things under those explications, are manifested to such Persons to be necessary to be believed? As *Leo 3.* defined in the Article of the *Holy Ghost's Procession from the Son*, To such, who by reason of capacity and apprehension, could attain to the knowledge of it, it was necessary to be believed, but not by others; as appears in our former Discourse on that Subject. Therefore from hence we see another account, why things may become necessary to be believed and owned as such, besides the Matter and the *Churches Definition*. These things may be said to be necessary to be believed by such, who believe the *Churches Proposition* to be sufficient, though it be not; as, suppose any Member of the *Greek Church* should believe their Church infallible, it is necessary, for such a one to believe whatever is propounded by that *Church*, though you suppose that judgment of his to be false in it self, because you say, the *Greek Church* is not infallible. So that from hence it appears, that the necessity arising from the *Churches Definition*, doth depend upon the *Conviction*, that whatever the *Church* defines, is necessary to be believed. And, where that is not received as an antecedent Principle, the other cannot be supposed. By this opening the several Grounds of *Necessity*, your difficulty concerning the *Athanasian Creed* comes to nothing: For granting, that the *Church of England* doth own and approve the *Creed*, going under the name of *Athanasius*, and supposing that her Use of the *Creed*, doth extend to the owning of those Expressions, which import the necessity of believing the things therein contained in order to Salvation; yet this doth not reach to your purpose, unless you prove that the *Church of England* doth own that necessity purely on the account of the

Churches

Churches Definition of those things which are not *Fundamental*, which it is very unreasonable to imagine; it being directly contrary to her sense in her nineteenth and twentieth Articles. And thence, that supposed necessity of the belief of the Articles of the *Athanasian Creed*, must, according to the sense of the *Church of England*, be resolved either into the necessity of the *Matters*, or into that necessity which supposeth clear *Convictions*, that the things therein contained are of *Divine Revelation*. From hence then it cannot at all follow, because the *Church of England* owns the *Creed of Athanasius*, therefore all things defined by the *Church* are, *eo nomine*, necessary to *Salvation*. Other particulars concerning that *Creed*, as to its *Antiquity* and *Authority*, we may have occasion afterwards more at large to discuss; it sufficeth now, that nothing is thence produced pertinent to the present Controversie.

§. 15. His Lordship, in the progress of this Discourse, takes away that slight
N. 8. p. 31, and poor Evasion, *That the Declaration of the Church makes any thing Fundamental*, quoad nos, because that no respect to us can vary the Foundation. And that the Churches Declaration can bind us only to Peace and external Obedience, where there is not express Letter of Scripture and Sense agreed on: But it cannot make any thing Fundamental to us, that is not so in its own nature: For, saith he, if the Church can so add, that it can by a Declaration make a thing to be Fundamental in the Faith that was not, then it can take a thing away from this Foundation, and make it by declaring not to be—Fundamental, which all Men grant no Power of the Church can do. For the power of adding any thing contrary, and of detracting any thing necessary, are alike forbidden, and alike
P. 18. denied. Now, you say, *That all this is satisfied by the foresaid distinction, of material and formal Object*; and you desire the Reader to carry along with him this distinction of *objectum materiale & formale*, *materia attestata*; & *authoritas attestantis*, and he will easily discover the Fallacies of his Lordship's Discourse, in this main Point of Controversie, and solve all his Difficulties supported by them. No doubt, an excellent Amulet to preserve from the Infection of Reason! But it is your great Mishap, that where you commend it so much, it doth you so little service: For, let your distinction of *formal and material Object*, be supposed as sound and good, as I have shewed it in your sense, to be false and fallacious; yet it doth not reach that part of his Lordship's Discourse, which you apply it to. For, still his Reason is conclusive, though the necessity only be supposed to arise from the Churches Authority, yet if it be in the power of the Church, to make any thing necessary which was not, why may it not be equally in her power to make something not necessary which was? For, either the grounds of the necessity of things to Salvation, doth depend on the Doctrine of the Gospel, as at first declared to the World, or it doth not. If it doth, then it is not in the Churches Power to make any thing necessary, which was not made necessary by it; if it doth not, then the Church may as well pretend to a power to make something not necessary, which was; as to make something necessary, which was not. So that your Distinction of *Formal and Material Object*, signifies nothing at all here, only this observable, that you make the Churches Definition to be the *Formal Object of Faith* here, which you very solemnly contradict afterwards. (Cap. 5. §. 4.) And can any thing be more evident from this Discourse of yours, than that you make the last resolution of Faith, as to the necessity of things to be believed into the Churches Definition, as its *Formal Object*? But this distinction with the grounds of it being removed in our former Discourse, I shall ease my self and the Reader of any further labour in examining what follows

lows in this Chapter, which depends wholly upon it; or else run out into the Churches Infallibility, the infallible Assent requisite to Faith, the Canon of Scripture, and our certainty of it, or the Authority of General Councils; all which shall be fully and particularly examined in their proper places. There being nothing said here, but what either hath been answered already, or will be more at large in a more convenient place.

The only things remaining then in this Chapter, which deserve a further discussion here, are the Testimonies of Scotus and St. Austin, and the Discourses which depend thereon. For our better clearing the Testimony of Scotus, in which you charge his Lordship with Falsification, we must consider on what account, and for what purposes that Testimony is produced. His Lordship had said before, That Fundamentals are a Rock *immoveable*, and can never be varied; therefore what is fundamental after the Church hath defined it; was Fundamental before the definition, and no Decrees of Councils, how general soever, can alter immovable Verities; wherefore, if the Church in a Council define any thing, the thing defined is not fundamental because the Church hath defined it; nor can be made so by the definition of the Church, if it be not so in it self. For if the Church hath this Power, she might make a New Article of Faith, which the learned among themselves deny. For the Articles of Faith cannot increase in substance, but only in explication: For which he appeals to Bellarmin. Nor, saith he, Is this hard to be further proved out of your own School. For Scotus professeth it in this very particular of the Greek Church. If there be, saith he, a true real difference between the Greeks and Latins about the Point of the Procession of the Holy Ghost, then either they or we be, verè hæretici, truly and indeed Hereticks. Which he speaks of the old Greeks long before any Decision of the Church in this Controversie. For he instances in St. Basil, and Greg. Nazianzen, on one side; and St. Jerome, Augustine, and Ambrose, on the other. And who dares call any of these Hereticks is his Challenge? That then which his Lordship proves by this Testimony, is, that the nature of Heresie doth not depend on the Churches Definition, but on the Nature of the thing; for, according to Scotus, antecedently to the Churches Definition, if there had been any real difference between the Greeks and Latins, one side of them had been Hereticks. To this you answer, That hence it follows not, that Scotus thought they could be Hereticks, unless they denied or doubted of that which they had reason to believe was revealed by God: But it only follows, that if they knew this (as those learned Greeks had sufficient reason to know it) they might well be esteemed Hereticks, before any special Declaration of the Church; although it be more clear, that he is an Heretick, who denies to believe that Doctrine, after he confesses that it is defined by the Church. From which answer of yours, several things are to our purpose observable. 1. That the Formal Reason of Heresie, is, denying something supposed to be of Divine Revelation. 2. That none can reasonably be accused of Heresie, but such as have sufficient reason to believe that which they deny is revealed by God. 3. That none can be guilty of Heresie, for denying anything declared by the Church; unless they have sufficient reason to believe, that whatever is declared by the Church, is revealed by God. Which unavoidably follows from the former, and therefore the Churches Definition cannot make any Hereticks, but such as have reason to believe that she cannot err in her Definitions. From whence Protestants will be in less danger of Heresie than Papists, till you give us more sufficient reasons to prove, that whatever the Church declares, is certainly revealed by God. And, although you tell us, Men may be accounted Hereticks before they are condemned as such by General Councils, if they op-

P. 19, 20, 21.

S. 16.

P. 29. n. 5.

N. 2.

P. 21.

pose

pose the Doctrine clearly contained in Scripture, or generally received by the Church; yet you tell us not, what the measures are, whereby we ought to judge what things are thus clearly contained in Scripture, or universally received; whether the Churches judgment must be taken, or every Man's own judgment: If the former, the ground of Heresie lies still in the Churches Definition, contrary to what Scotus affirms; if the latter, then no one can be an Heretick, but he that opposeth that which he is or may be convinced, is clearly contained in Scripture, or generally received by the Church. If that which he is convinced, then no Man is an Heretick, but he that goes against his present judgment, and so there will be few Hereticks in the World; If that which he may be convinced of, it must be understood either in his own judgment, or yours; if in his own judgment, then a Heretick is one who assents to things rashly, without using means to inform himself: If in yours, why may not he say, You may as well be convinced of the truth of that which he believes, as he be convinced of the truth of that which you believe; and so you may be a Heretick to him by the same reason that he is to you. But you say further, that there are many things, which in themselves are Matters of Faith; yet so obscure, in relation, especially to unlearned and particular Persons, that before the Decree of the Church, we are not Hereticks, though we should either doubt of them, or deny them; because, as yet, there appears no sufficient reason that can oblige us to believe them; although, after the Definition of the Church, we ought as well to believe them as any other. But it is impossible to understand how there can be such things which Men might safely not believe, but upon the Definition of the Church they are bound to believe them necessarily, unless it be clear to them, that the Church hath power to make obscure things plain, and unnecessary things to become necessary. For, suppose one of these obscure things be this very Power of the Church in defining such things, while this remains so obscure, you tell me I may not doubt or disbelieve it without Heresie, and while I do so, I may certainly doubt or disbelieve all she declares. But, by what means shall this thing become clear? Must it be by the Churches defining it? But that very Power of defining, is the thing in question, and therefore cannot be cleared by it. And if there be any thing then so obscure, that Men may without Sin doubt of it, or disbelieve it, certainly the Churches Power in defining Matters of Faith, is such; it being not capable by any Act of the Church, of being made so clear, as to oblige Men to believe it.

But we must see how his Lordship hath wronged the Testimony of Scotus: For first, say you, He would perswade his Reader, that this Author supposed a real difference between the Ancient Greek and Latin Fathers, about the Procession of the Holy Ghost; whereas Scotus declares, that there was no real difference between them: But doth his Lordship say, there was? Doth he not expressly cite Scotus his Testimony in an hypotheticalal manner; If there be a true real difference, &c. and it is evident from Scotus his words, that he

supposeth, If the difference had been real, that either the Greeks or Latins were truly Hereticks. And therefore you are guilty of a much greater Injury to his Lordship than he was to Scotus. Again, you say, He wrongs him, in saying, That after the Churches Definition, it be-

comes of the substance of Faith. Now, say you, Scotus hath not one word of the Substance of Faith, much less of Fundamental, which he imposes presently upon him, but says only thus, Ex quo Ecclesia declavarit hoc esse tenendum, &c. tenendum est, quod Spiritus Sanctus procedat ab utroque, Since the Church hath so declared, so it must be held. Sure you never expect to be be-

Pateret utiq; tandem, ipsam contrarietatem non esse veraciter realem, sicut est vocalis, alioquin vel ipsi Græci, vel nos Latini sumus verè hæretici. Scotus Dist. 11. l. 1. q. 1. sect. 2.

lieved, but by a very implicit Faith; for if one doth but offer to search an Author, your Jugling becomes notorious. Had you the confidence to say, That *Scotus* has not one word of the *Substance of Faith*; I pray who made that &c. for you in the Sentence? If you did it your self, you abuse your Readers; if another did it for you, he abused you: For that very &c. leaves out those words, *sicut de substantia fidei*, and try if you can render that otherwise, than as of the *Substance of Faith*; to manifest your *Forgery*, the whole place is cited in the Margin. Is this your Fidelity in quoting Authors, even when you charge others with wronging them? It may be you will say yet, That *Scotus* doth not say, it is to be held, *sicut de substantia fidei*,

Quicquid sit de iis ex quo Ecclesia Catholica declaravit hoc esse tenendum, sicut de substantia fidei, sicut patet extra. de sum. Trin. & fid. Cath. c. sumiser tenendum est quod Spiritus Sanctus procedat ab utroque, Scotus. ib.

though it be declared by the Church to be so held! But what means then the *ex quo*, if Men's Faith must not be guided by the Churches Declaration: For if it be therefore to be believed necessarily, because declared by the Church, it must be believed as it is declared by the Church: If therefore the Church declares that it is to be held as of the *Substance of Faith*, it ought to be held so by such as are bound to believe it on the Churches Declaration. Besides, you will not say, but that it was to be believed before; now, what alteration is caused by the Declaration of the Church, but this, That which was before to be believed simply and in it self, is now to be believed on the account of the Churches Declaration, as of the *Substance of Faith*. And thus it is impossible to relieve your self with your old Shift of *Material and formal Object*, which you betake your self to. Thus still we see you are that most unhappy Person, who never begin a Charge against your Adversary, but it falls back most unavoidably upon your self, who so readily make use of Forgeries, to prove others guilty of them.

Upon *Scotus* his mentioning the Churches Declaration, his Lordship enquires, *What this Declaration is, and how far it extends*. For which, his Lordship saith, *The Master teacheth, and his Scholars too, that every thing which belongs to the Exposition or Declaration of another, intus est, is not another contrary thing, but is contained within the bowels and nature of that which is interpreted: From which, if the Declaration depart, it is faulty and erroneous, because, instead of declaring, it gives another and contrary sense. Therefore when the Church declares any thing in Council, either that which she declares was intus or extra; in the nature and verity of the thing, or out of it. If it were extra, without the nature of the thing declared, then the Declaration of the thing is false; and so far from being Fundamental in the Faith. If it were intus, within the nature and compass of the thing, though not open and apparent to every eye; then the Declaration is true, but not otherwise Fundamental than the thing is which is declared: For that which is intus, cannot be larger or deeper, than that in which it is; if it were, it could not be intus. Therefore nothing is simply Fundamental, because the Church declares it; but because it is so, in the nature of the thing which the Church declares. In answer to this, you seem more ingenuous than usual; for you acknowledge, that his expression is learnedly solid and good: But yet you would seem to return some answer to this Argument, viz. although there be no alteration in the nature of the Ar-*

S. 17.
P. 31. n. 7.

P. 23.

so, and declares that they ought to be so quoad nos, as well as quoad se, and internally. And it is no evasion, but a solid distinction, that the Declaration of the Church varies not the thing in it self, but quoad nos in its respect to us. The substance of your Answer lies in this, That though the Church by her Declaration, doth not alter the nature of things, yet she may, and doth, our *Obligation to believe them*; so that such things which Men might have been saved without believing before, when once the Church hath declared them, become necessary to be believed in order to Salvation. And yet you would not have this called *making new Articles of Faith*: But I pray tell us, what you mean by *Articles of Faith*; are not those properly Articles of Faith, as distinct from *Theological Verities*, which are necessary to be believed by all? If therefore those things which the Church declares, were before not necessary, and by the *Churches Declaration* do become necessary; then certainly those things which were not *Articles of Faith*, do become Articles of Faith, and what then doth the Church by her Declaration, but make New Articles of Faith? But, though you assert the thing, you like not the Terms, because they do not sound so pleasantly to the Ears of Christians, who believe all *Obligation to Faith* doth depend upon immediate Divine Revelation. Setting aside therefore the terms, let us examine the thing, to see upon what Grounds the Church can make that necessary to us, which was not in it self. In which case the *Obligation* not arising from the necessity of the *Matter* in it self to be believed, it is no otherwise intelligible, but that it must result from the supposition of some *Immediate Revelation*. For nothing else can bind us to an *Internal Assent*, which you require as necessary to the Churches Definitions but that, unless you can shew how any Society of Men considered as such, have power to oblige all other Men to believe what they declare on pain of Damnation for not doing it. I pray tell me, whether the *Apostles* themselves had power to bind all *Christians* to the belief of something as necessary, which the *Spirit of God* did not immediately reveal to them to be so? If not, what Power can any Church have to do it, without a greater measure of *Infallibility*, than the *Apostles* ever pretended to? For, they never attempted to define any thing as necessary, which was supposed unnecessary to be believed after the *Doctrine* of the Gospel was declared to the World. Before then you can persuade us to believe that your Church can make any thing necessary, which was not so, you must prove an *Absolute Infallible Divine Assistance* of God's Spirit with your Church, in whatever she shall attempt to declare or define as Matter of Faith. As for instance, supposing it not necessary to Salvation in it self to believe the *Immaculate Conception* of the *Virgin Mary*, how is it possible to conceive, after your Churches Definition of it, it should become necessary, unless it be supposed that there was an *Immediate Divine Revelation*, in that Definition. For, nothing but *Divine Authority* commanding our Assent, the Ground of Faith must be resolved into that. Now in this case, besides the Immediate Assent to the thing declared as a Truth, there is a distinct Proposition to be believed, which is, That what was not before necessary to be believed, doth now become necessary to be believed by all; and shews us, either that there is *Divine Revelation* for this, or else excuse us, that we cannot give an *Internal Assent* to it. For, we have not learnt to give an Assent of Faith to a meer humane Proposition, or, in our *Saviour's* words, we call no Man, Master upon Earth, so as to promise to believe it in the power of any Church whatsoever, to make any thing necessary to be believed, which was not so before. Hence it appears, that your Distinction of, in se, & quoad nos, is as in-

signi-

significant, as your pretence of the Churches Power to define Matters of Faith is presumptuous and arrogant, being the highest degree of *Lording it over the Christian World*.

Why your Church may not as well declare something not to be of Faith, which before was of Faith, as declare something to be of Faith which before was not of Faith, it is not easie to apprehend, if that thing might be supposed of Faith before, without the Churches explicit Declaration. For in that case the Church would not so apparently contradict herself; for that *Contradiction* doth not lie in varying the respects of things, but in one Declaration contradicting another. For otherwise, it is as great a contradiction to say, That something which was not necessary, is become necessary; as that a thing which was necessary, is become not necessary. Therefore if there be a contradiction in one, there is in the other. If the Contradiction lies in the Declaration, you must say, That nothing could be supposed necessary to be believed, but what was declared by the Church to be so, and as declared by the Church: Which is a Province as difficult as necessary to be undertaken, to rid your hands of this Difficulty. For otherwise, that Answer of yours cannot reach the Objection.

And now we come to that Testimony of St. Augustine, which was produced to prove, That all Points defined by the Church are Fundamental:

Which say, *It is a thing founded. An erring Disputant is to be born with in other Questions, not diligently digested, not yet made firm by full Authority of the Church; there error is to be born with: But it ought not to proceed so far, that it should labour to shake the Foundation it self of the Church.* Now to this place his Lordship answers.

Fundata illa res est; ferendus est disputator errans in aliis questionibus, non diligenter digestis, nondum plena ecclesie auctoritate firmatis, ibi ferendus est error: non tantum progredi debet, ut etiam Fundamentum ipsum Ecclesie quaterè moliatur. August. serm. 14. de verb. Apostol. Tom. 10. p. 224. edit. Froben. 1529.

1. He speaks of a Foundation of Doctrine in Scripture, not of a Church-Definition: This appears, saith he, For few lines before, he tells us, There was a Question moved to St. Cyprian, Whether Baptism was concluded to the eighth day, as well as Circumcision? And, no doubt was made then of the beginning of Sin; and that out of this thing, about which no Question was moved, that Question that was made was answered. And again, that St. Cyprian took that which he gave in answer from the Foundation of the Church, to confirm a Stone that was shaking. Now St. Cyprian in all the Answer that he gives, hath not one word of any definition of the Church: Therefore ea res, that thing by which he answered was a Foundation of prime and settled Scripture Doctrine, not any Definition of the Church: Therefore that which he took out of the Foundation of the Church, to fasten the Stone that shook, was not Definition of the Church, but the Foundation of the Church it self, the Scripture upon which it is builded; as appeareth in the Milevitan Councils; where the Rule by which Pelagius was condemned, is the Rule of Scripture. Therefore St. Augustine goes on in the same sense, that the Disputer is not to be born any longer, that shall endeavour to shake the Foundation it self, upon which the whole Church is grounded. 2. His Lordship answers, That granting that the Churches Definition, was meant by St. Austin, yet it can never follow out of any, or all these Circumstances, that all Points defined by the Church are Fundamental, because this Foundation may be upon humane Authority; and that which follows, only is, That things are not to be opposed, which are made firm by full Authority of the Church; but it cannot be thence concluded, They are therefore Fundamental in the Faith. This is the substance of his Lordship's Answer to this place; which we must consider what you reply to. First, you say, That it cannot be doubted but that St. Austin's judgment was, that all our Faith depended on the

P. 24.

P. 32, 33.
n. 9, 10.

Pag. 25:

Authority of the Church, and therefore that he that opposeth himself against this, endeavoureth to shake and destroy the very Ground-work of all Divine Supernatural Faith. This is a rare way of silencing Adversaries, by telling them, That cannot be doubted, which others can see no reason at all to believe. As in this present case you tell me, that cannot be doubted, which I utterly deny, viz. That St. Austin's judgment was, that all our Faith depended on the Authority of the Church; and if all the proof you have for it, be only that well-known place, Ergo verò Evangelio non crederem, &c. You shall in time see, what an ill choice you made of fixing your proof wholly upon that. But whoever is never so little conversant in St. Augustine's way of disputing either against the Donatists, Pelagians, or Manichees, will find very little reason to doubt, but that he made the Foundation of Faith, to be God's Word, and not the Authority of the Church. Indeed S. Austin, by way of Prescription, often makes use of the Churches Authority, not where there hath been particular Definitions, but Universal Consent, which he understands by the settlement, by full Authority of the Church; but this he insists not on as the ground of Faith, but to shew the unreasonableness of Men's opposing those things which the Universal Church was agreed in, as in this Controversie here disputed by him concerning Original Sin in Infants. Therefore if I understand S. Austin in this place, he doth not at all speak concerning what is to be owned as a Matter of Faith simply in it self, but what the Churches Carriage towards Dissenters is. For after that Citation of St. Cyprian at the Conclusion of his Sermon, he addresseth himself to the Pelagians, as his dissenting Brethren; Therefore, saith he, Let us, if possible, intreat this

Impetremus ergo, si possumus, a fratribus nostris, ne nos insuper appellent Hæreticos; quod eos talia disputantes nos appellare possumus forsitan, si vellemus, nec tamen appellamus, Id. ib.

of our Brethren, That they would no longer call us Hereticks; because we might as well call them so if we would, but we do not. Why was St. Austin so scrupulous of calling the Pelagians Hereticks, if he made the Definition of the Church the Foundation of Faith, and look-

ed on this Controversie as defined by full Authority of the Church? And after, speaks of the Churches bearing with them still, in order to their instruction; though they were gone so far, that they were scarce to be born with; and that the Church exercised great patience towards them; therefore intreats them not to abuse this Patience of the Church, but to be reformed, since they did exhort as Friends, and not contend as Enemies. And so brings in the former words, which I thus paraphrase; It is a thing to be taken for granted, that in disputable Points, and such as the Church hath not always been agreed in, Dissenters may be born with: But if direct and full opposition to the clear sense of the Church should still be suffered, it would overthrow the very Foundation of the Church it self. And that this, and no other, is the plain and genuine meaning of St. Austin, is evident to any one who impartially considers Antecedents and Consequents, and the natural sense of the words themselves. Before, he spake how far the Church had born with them: in the words themselves, he tells them, They must not expect the Church would always bear with them, if they joined Obstinacy with their Errors, for that would ruine the Church, if she continually suffered such as violently opposed things contrary to her clearest sense: And after tells them, This

Non expedit: adhuc fortè nostra non est reprehendenda patientia; sed debemus timere, ne culpetur etiam negligentia.

is not expedient: For hitherto, it may be, our patience is not to be found fault withal; but we ought likewise to fear, lest we be blamed for our negligence: Which words immediately follow the former. And is not this now a

rare consequence, If the Church must not always bear with such as oppose her, then whatsoever is defined by the Church is Fundamental? For it

is most evident, St. *Austin* speaks not of the *Churches Power*, in defining Matters of Faith, but of the *Churches proceeding with obstinate Hereticks*. And therefore the *Foundation* spoken of, is not the *Foundation* of her Belief, but of her *Communion*; which the continual bearing with such obstinate Persons as the *Pelagians* were, would in time overthrow. The want of understanding this to be St. *Augustine's* meaning, hath made you spend many words to very little purpose, supposing all along that he speaks of the *Churches Definition*, and not her proceedings. Your Reply to his Lordship's second Answer, runs upon the same mistake, that he speaks of *Shaking the Foundation of Faith*, whereas I have already shewed, that he speaks of no such thing, and therefore that, as well as the former Answer, fall to the ground together, being both built on the same mistaken *Foundation*.

CHAP. III.

The Absurdities of the *Romanists* Doctrine of Fundamentals.

The Churches Authority must be Divine, if whatever she defines be Fundamental. His Lordship, and not the Testimony of St. Augustine, shamefully abused, three several ways. Bellarmine not mis-cited; the Pelagian Heresie condemned by the General Council at Ephesus. The Pope's Authority not implied in that of Councils. The gross Absurdities of the distinction of the Church teaching and representative, from the Church taught and diffusive, in the Question of Fundamentals. The Churches Authority and Testimony in Matters of Faith, distinguished. The Testimonies of Vincentius Lerinensis explained, and shewed to be directly contrary to the Roman Doctrine of Fundamentals. Stapleton and Bellarmine not reconciled by the vain endeavours used to that end.

THE main Doctrine of *Fundamentals* being in the foregoing Chapter settled and cleared, what remains of that subject will be capable of a quicker dispatch. The scope of this Chapter, is, to assail those Difficulties, which your Doctrine of *Fundamentals* is subject to. What little footing that hath in the place of St. *Augustine*, was the last thing discussed in the preceding Chapter; and therefore must not be repeated here. His Lordship urgeth this reason, why St. *Augustine*, or any other reasonable Man could not believe, that whatever is defined by the Church is *Fundamental in the Faith*; P. 34. n. 11; because full Church-Authority (always the time that included the Holy Apostles being past by, and not comprehended in it) is but Church-Authority; and Church-Authority, when it is at full Sea, is not simply Divine; therefore the sentence of it not *Fundamental in the Faith*. To this you very wisely and learnedly answer, I will not dispute with his Lordship, whether it be, or no; because it is P. 28. n. 1. sufficient that such Authority be infallible. For if it be infallible, it cannot propose to us any thing as revealed by God, but what is so revealed. So that to dispute against this Authority, is in effect to take away all Authority from Divine Revelation; we having no other absolute certainty, that this or that is revealed by God, but only the Infallibility of the Church proposing, or attesting it unto us as revealed. Whence also it follows, that to doubt, dispute against, or deny any thing that is proposed by the Infallible Authority of the Church, is to doubt, dispute against, and deny that which is *Fundamental in Faith*. His Lordship denies the Sentence of the Church to be *Fundamental in the Faith*, because not Divine; you dare not say, It is Divine but contend that it is *Infallible*, and from that Infallibility infer, That Whosoever denies the Churches Infallibility,

libility, must deny something Fundamental in the Faith, because we can have no other absolute certainty that any thing is revealed by God, but only from the Churches Infallibility. So that your whole Proof rests upon a very rotten and uncertain Foundation, viz. that all certainty in Matters of Faith, doth depend upon the Churches Infallibility; the falshood and unreasonableness of which Principle, will at large be discovered in the succeeding Controversie. And if this falls, then the denial of the Churches Infallibility doth not infer the denial of any thing Fundamental in the Faith, because Men may be certain of all Fundamentals, without believing this Infallibility. But yet, say you, There is no necessity of asserting Church-Authority to be Divine, but only to be infallible, in order to the making what she defines to be Fundamental. A rare and excellent piece of your old Theological Reason! as though any thing could be any further Infallible than it is Divine, or any further owned to be Divine, than as it is Infallible. I pray, acquaint us with these rare Arts of distinguishing between an Authority Divine and Infallible, when the ground of that Infallibility, is the supposition of something properly and simply Divine, which is the Infallible Assistance of God's Spirit. Is that Assistance Infallible too, but not Divine? If it be Divine, as well as Infallible, how comes that Infallibility which flows from it not to be Divine, when the cause of it was simply and absolutely so? Besides, what Infallible Authority is that which makes all its Definitions Fundamental, and yet is not in it self Divine? From whence comes any thing to be Fundamental? You tell us your self, as it is known to be revealed by God. And can any thing be known to be revealed by God, but by an Authority Divine? Especially on your Principles, who make all certainty of knowing it to depend on that Churches Authority? If so, then since the Churches Sentence makes things become Matters of Faith, some things may become Matters of Faith, which have no Divine Authority for them. But this excellent and subtle distinction between Divine and Infallible Authority, we shall have occasion to examine afterwards. And therefore it is well you tell us, Notwithstanding the Infallible and Divine, seem to many great Divines to be terms convertible, which only acquaints us with thus much, that there are some Men who understand things better than you do; and that to do so, is to be a great Divine. And if Stapleton be one of these, we are not much offended at it; and so far we will take the Testimonies which you produce out of him.—That which next follows depends upon the Proof of the Infallibility of General Councils, which when you have sufficiently cleared, we will believe that there can be no plain Scripture, or evident Reason against any of their Definitions, but till then we must believe there may be room for both.

§. 2. Your next Section promiseth to shew us a shameful Abuse of St. Augustine's Testimony three several ways; but, if it appears, that not one of those ways will hold, then it only follows, that so many ways you have abused his Lordship, and not he St. Augustine. His Lordship having affirmed, P. 32. D. 11. That plain Scripture with evident sense, or a full demonstrative Argument, must have room, where a wrangling and erring Disputer may not be allowed it. And there's neither of these but may convince the Definition of the Council, if

Aug. contra it be ill founded. Over against these words he cites that sentence of St. Augustine, ep. Fundam. c. 4. *Quæ quidem si tam manifesta monstratur, ut in dubium venire non possit, præponenda est omnibus illis rebus, quibus in Catholica teneor. Ita si aliquid apertissimum in Evangelio, &c.* The plain meaning of which words of St. Augustine, is, That evident Truth is to be preferred before all Church-Authority: Now a threefold Exception you take to his Lordship's insisting on this Testimony. 1. That St. Austin speaks not either of plain Scripture, or evident sense,

sense, or of a full demonstrative Argument ; but addressing his Speech to the Manicheans, he writes thus, *Apud vos autem ubi nihil horum est quod me invitet ac teneat, sola personat veritatis pollicitatio* (and then follow the words cited by the Bishop) *quæ quidem si tam manifesta monstratur ; where it is plain quæ, which, is relative only to Truth, and not to Scripture, or any thing else.* A wonderful abuse of St. Austin to make him parallel plain Scripture, evident Sense, or a full demonstrative Argument with Truth ! As though if evident Truth were more prevalent with him than all those Arguments which held him in the Catholick Church, plain Scripture, evident Sense, or Demonstrations would not be so too. What Truth can be evident, if it be not one of these three ? Do you think, there is any other way of manifesting Truth, but by Scripture, Sense, or Demonstration ? If you have found out other ways, oblige the World by communicating them ; but till then, give us leave to think, that it is all one to say, Manifest Truth, as plain Scripture, evident Sense, or clear Demonstrations. But, say, you, *He speaks only of that Truth which the Manichees bragged of, and promised :* As though St. Austin would have been perswaded sooner as it came from them, than as it was Truth in it self. I suppose, St. Austin did not think their Testimony sufficient, and therefore says, *Quæ quidem si tam manifesta monstratur, &c. i. e.* If they could make that which they said, evident to be Truth, he would quit the Church, and adhere to them : And if this holds against the Manichees, will it not on the same reason hold every where else, viz. That manifest Truth is not to be quitted on any Authority whatsoever ? Which is all his Lordship asserts.

But, You offer to prove that St. Austin, by Truth, could not mean plain Scripture ; But can you prove, that by Truth, he did not mean Truth, wherever he found it, whether in Scripture, or elsewhere ? No, say you, *It cannot be meant, that by Truth, he should mean plain Scripture, in opposition to the Definitions of the Catholick Church, or General Councils ;* For which you give this Reason, *because he supposes it impossible, that the Doctrine of the Catholick Church, should be contrary to Scripture ; for then Men, according to St. Austin, should not believe infallibly, either the one or the other. Not the Scriptures, because they are received only upon the Authority of the Church ; nor the Church, whose Authority is infringed by the plain Scripture which is brought against her.* For which you produce a large Citation out of St. Austin to that purpose. But the Answer to that is easie. For St. Austin, when he speaks of Church-Authority, *quæ infirmatâ jam nec Evangelio credere potero ;* he doth not in the least understand it of any Definitions of the Church ; but of the Universal Tradition of the Catholick Church concerning the Scriptures from the time of Christ and his Apostles. And what plain Scriptures those are supposable, which should contradict such a Tradition as this is, is not easie to understand. But the case is quite otherwise as to the Churches Definitions ; for neither doth the Authority of Scripture at all rest upon them ; and there may be very well supposed some plain Scriptures contrary to the Churches Definitions, unless it be proved, that the Church is absolutely infallible, and the very proof of that depending on Scripture, there must be an appeal made to plain Scripture, whether the Churches Definitions may not be contradicted by Scripture. When therefore you say, *This is an impossible Supposition, that Scripture should contradict the Churches Definitions, like that of the Apostle ; If an Angel from Heaven teach otherwise, let him be accursed, Gal. i.* You must prove it as impossible for the Church to deviate from Scripture in any of her Definitions, as for an Angel to Preach another Gospel ; which will be the braver attempt, because it seems so little befriended either by Sense or Reason.

son. But, say you, *If the Church may be an erring Definer, I would gladly know, why an erring Disputer may not oppugn her.* That which you would so gladly know, is not very difficult to be resolved, by any one who understands the great difference between yielding an *Internal Assent* to the *Definitions* of the *Church*, and *open opposing* them; for it only follows from the possibility of the *Churches* Error in defining, that therefore we ought not to yield an *absolute Internal Assent* to all her Determinations, but must examine them by the best Measures of Truth, in order to our full Assent to them: But, though the *Church may err*, it doth not therefore follow, that it is lawful in all Cases, or for all Persons, to oppugn her Definitions, especially if those Definitions be only in order to the *Churches* Peace: But if they be such as require Internal Assent to them, then plain Scripture, evidence of Sense, or clear Reason, may be sufficient cause to hinder the submitting to those Definitions.

Ibidem.

2. You tell us, *That his Lordship hath abused St. Austin's Testimony, because he speaks not of the Definitions of the Church, in Matters not Fundamental, according to the Matter they contain; but the Truth mentioned by him was Fundamental in its Matter.* This is the Substance of your second Answer, which is very rational and prudent, being built on this substantial Evidence. If *St. Austin* doth prefer manifest Truth before things supposed *Fundamental in the Matter*, then, no doubt, *St. Austin* would not prefer manifest Truth, before things supposed not *Fundamental in the Matter*. And do not you think this enough to charge his Lordship with shamefully abusing *St. Austin*? But certainly, if *St. Austin* preferred manifest Truth before that which was greater, would he not do it before that which was incomparably less? If he did it before all those things which kept him in the *Catholic Church*, such as the consent of Nations, Miracles, Universal Tradition, which he mentions before; do you think he would have scrupled to have done it, as to any particular *Definitions* of the *Church*? These are therefore very excellent ways of vindicating the *Fathers* Testimonies, from having any thing of Sense or Reason in them.

s. 3.

3. You say, *He hath abused St. Austin, by putting in a wrangling Disputer:* But I wonder where his Lordship ever says, that *St. Austin* mentions any such in the Testimony cited. For his words are these. *But, plain Scripture, with evident Sense, or a full demonstrative Argument must have room, where a wrangling and erring Disputer may not be allowed it. And there's neither of these* (over against these words, he refers to *St. Austin's* Testimony, and not the foregoing) *but may convince the Definition of the Council, if it be ill founded.* When you therefore ask, *Where the wrangling Disputer is to be found*; had it not been for the help of this Cavil, we might have been to seek for him. But when you have been enquiring for him, at last you cry out, *Evangel.* *Oh! I see now:* And you are the fittest Man to find him out that I know. You say, *This is done to distinguish him from such a Disputer as proceeds solidly and demonstratively against the Definitions of the Church, when they are ill founded; which St. Austin is so far from supposing that one may do, that he judges him a mad Man, who disputes against any thing quod universa Ecclesia sentit; and that they have Hearts, not only of Stone, but even of Devils, who resist so great a Manifestation of Truth, as is made by an Oecumenical Council, for of that he speaks.* Your design is to prove, that *St. Austin* doth not admit of any plea from Scripture, Sense, or Reason, against any Definitions of the *Church*, for which you first produce that known place in which *St. Austin* accounts it madness to oppose the universal Practices of the *Church*, which will hold for your purpose, as far as Rites and Matters of Faith have

-p. 32.

have any Analogy with each other; your latter Testimony seems more to the purpose to all Persons who do not examine it, and to none else. For, although you seemed very careful to prevent any examination of the place by a false Citation of *Epist.* 153, for 152. yet that hath not hindered my discovering your *Fraud*, in asserting, that *St. Austin* there speaks of an *Oecumenical Council*. For there is not so much as any thing like it in that *Epistle*. I acknowledge those words to be found there which you produce, *Nulla excusatio jam remansit: nimium dura, nimium diabolica sunt hominum corda, quæ adhuc tantæ manifestationi veritatis obsistunt*. But there needs no more to confute the most of your Testimonies out of the *Fathers*, but to mention the occasion of their being produced; or the scope and design of the *Authors*, as is most evident in this place. For this *Epistle* is written in the Name of *Silvanus, Valentinus, Aurelius, Innocentius, Maximinus, Optatus, Augustinus, Donatus*, and other *Bishops*, for satisfaction of the *Donatists* concerning the proceedings at the *Council of Carthage*; for the *Donatist Bishops* being therein baffled, had dispersed among their *Profelytes* many false Rumours of that *Council*, and of their being circumvented by their *Catholic Adversaries*. To disprove which in this *Epistle*, they first shew the *Fraud and Falsity* of the *Donatists*, and then the *Integrity* of their own proceedings, by the choice of seven Persons on either side, who should speak in behalf of the rest; and seven others as Counsellors to them; and four Notaries on either side, and four other Persons who should keep the *Records* to prevent all *Fraud*. Besides all this, every one was to subscribe in his own words, that no Man might complain that any thing was corrupted afterwards; which things being dispersed, while the Persons themselves lived, there was no probability *Posterity* should be deceived in the report of them. And then follow those words; *That no Excuse hath now been left, but that their Hearts are too hard and Diabolical, who could gainsay so clear a manifestation of Truth*. Is it not now a rare Consequence from hence to infer, That it is not lawful upon any ground of *Scripture, Sense, or Reason*, to dispute the *Definitions* of *General Councils*? Whereas no such thing was ever mentioned as a *General Council*, as appears by the very next words, where he says expressly, it was only a *Council of African Bishops*; and elsewhere *St. Austin* tells the *Donatists*, that they never durst appeal to a *General Council*. And supposing the *Council* never so *Oecumenical*, he mentions nothing of the *Definitions* of it, but the manner of its proceedings. So that the greatest Truth hereby manifested, is, your design to abuse his Lordship and the Reader together.

Ecce putamus illos Episcopos qui Roma judicant, non bonos judi-

ces fuisse, restabat adhuc plenarium Ecclesiæ universæ Concilium, ubi etiam cum ipsis iudicibus causa posset agitari, ut si male judicasse convicti essent, eorum sententiæ solverentur. Quod utrum fecerint, probent. Nos enim non factum esse facile probamus, ex eo quod totus orbis non iis communicat. Aug. Epist. 162.

Since you disown the distinction of things being *Fundamental* in the matter and in the manner, I shall not trouble you with shewing you the weakness of it: But it were easie to manifest it as good as that you embrace of the *Material and Formal Object*, which hath been sufficiently refuted in the precedent Chapter, and I have no leisure for Repetitions.

S. 4.

His Lordship endeavouring further to shew, *What little Foundation your Doctrine of Fundamentals hath in the forecited place of St. Augustine*; urgeth this as an *Argument against it*, That if all *Points* defined by the Church, are therefore *Fundamental*, because that is not to be shaken, which is settled by full Authority of the Church; then it must follow, That the *Point* there spoken of, the remission of *Original Sin*, in the *Baptism of Infants*, was defined when *St.*

P. 35. n. 13.

M

Augu-

Augustine wrote this, by a full Sentence of a General Council. You deny the Consequence ; for, say you, By Authority of the Church you mean (and not improperly) the Church generally practising this Doctrine, and defining it in a National Council confirmed by the Pope. For this was *plena autoritas Ecclesiae*, though not *plenissima* ; and to dispute against what was so practised and defined, is, in St. Augustine's sense, to shake the Foundation of the Church, if not wholly to destroy it. It seems a little hard to understand what you mean by the Churches being (not improperly) said to practise this Doctrine : What, did the Church practise the Doctrine of the remission of Original Sin in Infants ? That a Church should practise a Matter of Faith, seems a little wonderful ; but that it should do this and that not improperly, increaseth the admiration. And we might think it a peculiar privilege belonging to your Church, but that she is not so much used to practise things more capable of it. And can you think it enough to run us down, by telling us, That the Pope, with a National Council, hath defined it, unless you first prove, that the Pope, and a National Council, have as much Authority as a General Council, which you pretend to be infallible ; and if a National Council with the Pope be so too, I wonder to what end General Councils are ever call'd, since the Infallibility may be had at a much cheaper rate.

And by the same reason you make National Councils Infallible, you may do Provincial, if the Pope concurs with them ; and, by the same reason, the College of Cardinals may be infallible without any of them, because of the Pope's concurrence with them. And so, all this business of Councils, is but a formal piece of Pageantry, since all the Infallibility they have by this Pretence, is conferred by the Pope in his Concurrence ; whose Infallibility doth not depend on the presence of a Council ; and therefore he must be as Infallible without a Council, as with it. So that at last this Discourse comes to this Issue, He that shakes the Pope's Infallibility, shakes the Foundation of the Church : and prove but this to have been St. Augustine's meaning, you will highly advance the Interest of your Cause.

§. 5. But, whatever St. Austin's meaning be, you think your self engaged to vindicate Bellarmine, who, his Lordship had said, was deceived, in saying, P. 32. n. 2. That the Pelagian Heresie was never condemned in an Oecumenical Council, but only in National. For, saith he, While the Pelagians stood out impudently against National Councils, some of them defended Nestorius, which gave occasion to the first Ephesine Council, to Excommunicate and Depose them. To which P. 33. n. 3. you answer, 1. It is not credible, that Bellarmine, who writ so much of Controversie, should not have read that Council ; nor can there be any suspicion of his concealing the matter, had he found it there, &c. and therefore you suspend your Assent till the Council's words be produced. 2. You tell us, That it is not enough to prove that Pelagianism was condemned by a General Council, because some who were Pelagians were ; but, say you, They were condemned not for Pelagianism, but Nestorianism, and therefore his Lordship shoots wide of the Mark. Your Argument from Bellarmine will have no great force with them, who see no reason to admire his Fidelity ; and they who enquire into the Matter of Fact, in the present debate, will have cause to suspect it. The short account whereof is this. After that Julianus, Florus, Orontius, Fabius and others, had been deposed and banished in the Western Churches, for the Pelagian Heresie, they fly to Constantinople, and shroud themselves under the Protection of Nestorius the Patriarch there, who secretly favoured them, and writ several Letters to Pope Celestine in behalf of them ; who is supposed to have received his Doctrine of the Person of Christ from the Pelagians. But when he saw that no good was to be done by these Letters, but by

by the daily spreading of *Nestorianism*, the Emperor was forced to summon a Council at *Ephesus*, A. D. 431. The *Pelagians* accompany *Nestorius* thither, and joyn with *Johannes Antiochenus*, and his Party, in opposition to the Synod. But the Council understanding the proceedings which had been in the *Western Churches* against the *Pelagians*, ratifies and confirms their Deposition, as appears by the Synodal Epistle of the Council to *Pope Celestine*, which is extant in the *Acts* of the *Ephesine Council*: And in the Epistles of *Cyril of Alexandria*. And besides this, some of the *Canons* of that Council, do equally concern *Celestius* and *Nestorius*; the first Canon decreeing as well the favourers of *Celestius* as *Nestorius* to be excommunicate; and the fourth decreeing the Deposition of all such who should embrace either of them.

And therefore it is truly said by *Jansenius*, that the *Pelagian Heresie*, and the Bishops who favoured it, were again condemned by an *Oecumenical Council*. And thence *Prosper* in the Epitaph of the *Nestorian* and *Pelagian Heresies*, as he makes the *Nestorian* only an Offspring of the *Pelagian*; so he makes both of them to fall, and be condemned together. From whence it appears, that the *Pelagians* were not condemned in the *Ephesine Council* meerly for *Nestorianism*, but for their proper and peculiar Sentiments; the former Deposition of them being ratified by the Council, and a new Canon made to that purpose for the future. And now let the Reader judge whether his Lordship or *Bellarmino* were herein the more mistaken.

His Lordship adds; If this Heresie were condemned only by a National Council, then the full Authority of the Church here, is no more than the full Authority of this Church of *Africk*. And I hope, saith he, That Authority doth not make all Points defined by it, to be Fundamental. You will say, Yes: If that Council be confirmed by the Pope. And then I must ever wonder, why *St. Augustine* should say, The full Authority of the Church; and not bestow one word upon the Pope, by whose Authority only that Council, as all other, have their fulness of Authority in your judgment. An inexpiable Omission; if this Doctrine concerning the Pope were true. To this you answer, That there was no need of any special mention of the Pope, in speaking of the Authority of the Church; because his Authority is always chiefly supposed, as being Head of the whole Church. But by whom was this supposed? By you, or by *St. Augustine*? Can you prove that *St. Austin*, or any of the *African Fathers* did ever suppose any such thing, that the Pope being Head of the Church, his Authority is chiefly supposed in the *Acts* of National Councils? Where was the supposal of this Authority in the Dispute between the *African Fathers*, and the *Popes*, in the case of Appeals? These are Suppositions, only to be obtruded upon ignorant *Novices*; and such, who look no further into *Antiquity*, than the Implicit Faith in their Priests will give them leave. But what a stranger to all true *Antiquity* this Supposition of the Pope's being Head of the Church, is, we shall see abundantly, when we come to the Controversie of the Pope's Authority. Yet granting the Supposition true (than which nothing can be more false) when the main strength lies not in the bare Definition of a National Council, which you grant of it self hath not full Authority, but in the confirmation of that Decision by the Pope which makes that Authority full, which was not so before; Was it not necessary to declare, that the Pope did concur to the giving it full Authority, which without it could not be had? You do not say, That all National Councils have this full

Paulo post enim, legis Commentarii Romæ sub Cælestino conscriptis, & hæresis ipsa Pelagiana, & authores, fautoresque ejus episcopi, ab Oecumenica Synodo iterum condemnati sunt, Jansenius de hæres. Pelag. lib. 1. p. 31.

*Nestoriana lues successi Pelagiana,
Qua tamen est usero progenerata meo.
Me tamen una dedit villam sententia lethæ:
Illa volens interum surgere, bis cecidit.
Mecum oritur, mecum moritur, mecumque
sepulchrum
intrat, & inferni carceris ima subit.*

*Prosper in Epitaph. Nestor.
& Pelag. hæres.*

s. 6.
P. 36.

P. 33. n. 4.

Authority, not being confirmed by the Pope ; if therefore St. Augustine designed to shew that Council to have full Authority, the only way to prove it, was to produce the Pope's Confirmation of it : Which cannot therefore be otherwise looked on, than as an *inexpiable Omission*, if your Doctrine be true ; for he left out that which was only pertinent and material to the Business. Your Parallel between St. Austin and your self (which is a very worthy one) in leaving out the mention of the Pope's Authority when it is understood, will then hold when you produce as great evidence that St. Austin was a Jesuit, as we have from your Principles that you are. When you give us manifest proof, that the Pope's Power is necessary to all Definitions of Councils, as there is in our Laws for our Kings assenting to Acts of Parliament ; we may give you leave to parallel the Omission of the express mention of one with the other. If the Definitions of Ancient Councils did run in the name of Pope and Council, as our Acts of Parliament, in the name of the King, and both Houses, we might easily say, the Authority of them came from the Pope, as of these from the King ; but there is nothing of that nature, but much of the contrary, as will appear in due time. When you therefore prove that the Pope's Power is implied, though it be not mentioned, you must prove it by some evident Confession, that no Authority of a Council was full, unless the Pope concurred with it : Else you may as well say, That the Great Mogul hath no full Authority to decree any thing without the Pope's consent ; for I dare say, There is no denial of it in any of his Laws. And yet, that is more than can be said here, for we have sufficient Testimony from the Records of that Age, That the Pope's Authority was not supposed necessary to Councils, from his being Head of the Church. What follows, p. 34. n. 5, 6. depends wholly upon the often-mentioned distinction of the *Formal and Material Object* of Faith ; the Foundation of which, having been already removed, whatever you offer to build upon it, must of necessity fall to the ground ; but I shall not follow your ill Example, in making tedious Repetitions, and then cry out, *You are forced to it.*

- S. 7. His Lordship urgeth further, from the Romanists Doctrine of Fundamentals, That the Churches Definition must be the Churches Foundation. His words are, Besides, whatsoever is Fundamental in the Faith, is Fundamental to the Church, which is one by the Unity of Faith : Therefore, if every thing defined by the Church be Fundamental in the Faith, then the Churches Definition is the Churches Foundation. And so, upon the matter, the Church can lay her own Foundation, and then the Church must be in absolute and perfect Being, before
- P. 36. n. 14. so much as her Foundation is laid. To which you answer ; But what Absurdity is it to grant, That the Definition of the Church teaching, is the Foundation of the Church taught ? Or, the Definition of the Church Representative, is the Foundation of the Church Diffusive ? I pray, inform us whether this Church Teaching and Representing, be the same Church with the Church taught and diffusive, or one different from it : If it be different, it must have a different Foundation, and so must be fundamentally different ; if it be the same, then the Church must still lay its own Foundation : For whatever becomes Fundamental by the Definition of the Church, is, I suppose, to be believed as necessary, i. e. Fundamental, by the Church Teaching and Representing, as well as taught and diffusive. Unless you think those who decree things, to be believed by all in order to Salvation, do exclude themselves out of that number ; and therefore, though it be necessary for all others to believe it, it is still indifferent for them, whether they will believe it or no. And therefore, were I of your Church, I should heartily wish my self of the Teaching and Representative Church ;

Church; for then others might go to *Hell* for not believing that, which I might chuse whether I would or no. What an excellent invention this is, to make the *Pope* and *Cardinals* go to *Heaven*, though they be *Atheists* and *Infidels*? For, you tell us; we can have no assurance of any Matter of Faith, but from the *Infallibility* of your *Church*; this *Infallibility* lies not in the *taught* and *diffusive*, but in the *teaching* and *representative Church*; and this distinction here supposes, that what is made the *Foundation* of the *Church taught*, is not the *Foundation* of the *Church teaching*, i. e. what is necessary to Salvation for one, is not so for the other; for that is your meaning of *Fundamentals*. Now, since all things become necessary to be believed by the *Church diffusive*, upon the Authority of the *Church representative*; it necessarily follows, from this distinction, That nothing at all is necessary to be believed by the *Church representative*. And is not this a rare *Church* the mean while? But what is it which makes it a *Church*? for though it *represents* and *teaches*, yet it is still call'd a *Church teaching* and *representative*: If it be a *Church*, something must make it so: What can make it so, if not the belief of what is *necessary to Salvation*? And if it doth not believe all that is necessary to Salvation, the *Church diffusive* is much more truly a *Church*, than the *representative*: If it doth believe all that is necessary, then it must believe its own *Definitions*, because those are supposed to be so; and consequently, if those be *Fundamental*, the *Church must still lay her own Foundation*. Or else these Consequences follow. 1. That may be a true *Church*, which doth not believe all things necessary to Salvation. 2. The *Church teaching* is not bound to believe that which she *teaches*, but only the *Church taught*. 3. That may be the same *Church* which *Fundamentally* differs from it self. 4. When the *Church* defines a thing to be *necessary*, she doth not believe it to be *necessary*, but it becomes necessary after her *Definition*. For, I pray, satisfy us as to this *Teaching Church*, when she defines something necessary to be believed in order to Salvation, which was not so defined before; Doth she at that *Instant* of her *Definition* believe that to be necessary to Salvation, or doth she not? If she doth, then it is necessary before her *Definition*; and so the belief of it as necessary, cannot depend upon it: But if she believes it only to be necessary, because she defines it to be so; then she cannot believe it to be necessary, till she hath defined it, and consequently defines that to be necessary, which she believes not to be necessary: And so defines contrary to her own judgment and belief. Let me therefore ask her some more Questions, which I doubt you will think troublesome, If the *Church representative* believed that *not to be necessary* to Salvation, which she defined to be *necessary to Salvation*, was she infallible in that belief or no? If she was not infallible, then at that time what assurance could Men have of any Matter of Faith, since you tell us, That must be had from the *Churches Infallibility*? If she were infallible, then either in *some things only*, or in *all* she believed? If only in *some things* we ought to know what she is infallible in, and what not, lest we deceive our selves in believing her infallible in that in which she is not infallible? If in *all things*, then she is infallible in believing that *not to be necessary* to Salvation, which yet she infallibly defines to be *necessary* to Salvation: And so the *Church* may infallibly define that to be *true*, which at the very moment of that *Definition*, she infallibly believes to be false. All these are the just and excellent Consequences of this useful Distinction of *yours*, which you look on as the only happy Expedient, whereby to free your self from asserting, that the *Church*, by making things *Fundamental*, by her *Definitions*, doth thereby lay her own *Foundation*.
But

S. 8.

Ibid.

But as absurd and unreasonable as this is, you would seem to have something to say for it : For you tell us, *That the Pastors, in all Ages preserving Christian People from being carried away with every Wind of Doctrine, are a Foundation to them of constancy in Doctrine.* Wonderfully subtle ! it is pity such excellent Reasoning should want the Ornaments of Mood and Figure : But thus it is in them. If the Pastors of the Church may be the means of preserving Men from Errors, then the Definition of the *Church Teaching*, is the Foundation of the *Church taught* : Which in short amounts to this ; If the *Pastors* of the *Church* may be a Foundation of Men's *Constancy in Doctrine*, then they may be a Foundation of Men's *Inconstancy in Doctrine*. If this be not that you mean, I can make no sense of what you say ; and if it be, let any one else make *Sense* of it, that hath a gift for it. For, by *Constancy in Doctrine*, is meant, the adhering to that *Doctrine* which *God hath revealed* as necessary in his Word, but by the Definitions of the *Teaching Church*, you understand a Power to make more things necessary to the Salvation of all than *Christ* hath made ; so that, joyn these two together, the Consequence is this : If the *Pastors* of the *Church* may, and ought to keep Men from believing any other *Doctrine*, then they have power to impose *another Doctrine* ; which things are so contradictory to each other, that none but one of your *Faculty* would have ventured to have set one to prove the other. Therefore when you would prove any thing by this Argument, your *Medium* must be this, That the *Pastors* of the *Church* are a *Foundation of Constancy in Doctrine*, by laying *New Foundations of Doctrines* by her Definitions, which is just as if you would prove, That the best way to keep a House entire, without any Additions, is to build another House adjoining to it.

But, say you further, *Were not the Apostles in their times (who were Ecclesia docens) by their Doctrines and Decrees, a Foundation to the Church which was taught by them ? Doth not St. Paul expressly affirm it, superædificati supra Fundamentum Apostolorum, &c.* To which I answer, 1. That the *Apostles* were not therefore said to be the *Foundation* on which they were built who believed on that *Doctrine*, because, by virtue of their *Power*, they could define or decree any thing to be necessary to Salvation, which was not so before ; but, because they were the *Instruments* whereby the things which were necessary to Salvation, were conveyed to them. And because their Authority, by virtue of their *Mission*, and the *Power* accompanying it, was the means whereby they were brought to believe the *Doctrine* of the *Gospel*, as in it self true. But there is a great deal of difference between *teaching* what is necessary to Salvation, and making any thing necessary to Salvation, which was not before, meerly because it is taught by them. 2. I grant, that those things did become necessary to be believed, which the *Apostles* taught ; but it was either because the things were in themselves necessary, in order to the end declared, *viz. Man's Salvation*, or else it was on the account of that evidence which the *Apostles* gave, that they were Persons immediately employed by *God*, to deliver those *Doctrines* to them. But still here is nothing becoming necessary, by virtue of a Decree or Definition, but by virtue of a *Testimony*, that what they delivered, came from *God*. 3. When the *Apostles* delivered these things, the *Doctrine* of the *Gospel* was not made known to the World ; but they were chosen by *God*, and infallibly assisted for that end, that they might reveal it to the World : And this is certainly a very different case from that, when the *Doctrine* of Salvation is fully revealed and delivered down to us in unquestionable Records. And therefore, if you will prove any thing to your purpose, you must prove as great and

and as Divine Assistance of the Spirit in the *Church representative* of all Ages, as was in the *Apostles* in the first Age of the Christian Church. 4. When you say from hence, That the *Apostles*, as the *Teaching Church*, laid the *Foundation of the Church taught*; that can only be understood of those *Christians* who became a *Church*, by the *Apostles* Preaching the *Doctrine* of the *Gospel* to them: But this is quite a different thing from laying the *Foundation* of a *Church* already in being as your *Church*, taught, and diffusive, is supposed to be. Can you tell us, where the *Apostles* are said to lay further *Foundations* for *Churches* already constituted; that they made or declared more things necessary to *Salvation*, than were so antecedently to their being a *Church*? But this is your case, you pretend a *Power* in your *Church Representative*, to make more things necessary to *Salvation*, than were before to a *Church* already in *Being*, and therefore supposed to believe all things necessary to *Salvation*. You see therefore, what a vast disparity there is in the case, and how far the *Apostles* declaring the *Doctrine of Christ*, and thereby founding *Churches*, is from being an Argument that the *Representative Church*, may lay the *Foundation of the Church Diffusive*, which being a *Church* already, must have its *Foundation* laid before all new *Decrees* and *Definitions* of the *Teaching Church*. So that still it unavoidably follows upon your Principles, That the *Church must lay her own Foundation*, and then the *Church* must have been in absolute and perfect *Being*, before so much as her *Foundation* is laid. Your weak endeavour of retorting this upon the *Bishop*, because of the *Apostles* teaching the *Church* of their Age, only shews, that you have a good will to say something in behalf of so bad a cause, but that you want ability to do it: As appears by the Answers already given, as to the difference of the *Apostles* case and yours. The subsequent *Section*, which is spent in a weak Defence of *A. C.'s words*, hath the less cause to be particularly examined; and besides, its whole strength lies on things sufficiently discussed already, viz. the sufficient Proposition of *Matters of Faith*, and the *Material and Formal Object* of it.

P. 39.

That which follows pretending to something *New*, and which looks like Argumentation, must be more distinctly considered. *A. C.'s words* are, *That if one may deny, or doubtfully dispute against any one Determination of the Church, then he may against another, and another, and so against all: Since all are made firm to us by one and the same Divine Revelation, sufficiently applied by one and the same full Authority of the Church; which being weakened in any one, cannot be firm in any other.* To which his Lordship answers, 1. *That this is understood only of Catholick Maxims, which are properly Fundamental, by Vincentius Lirinensis, from whom this Argument is derived.* 2. *He denies, that all Determinations of the Church are made firm to us by one and the same Divine Revelation.* 3. *He denies, that all Determinations of the Church are sufficiently applied by one and the same full Authority of the Church.* Of each of these he gives his Reasons; the examination and defence of which, is all that remains of this Chapter. To the first, you answer three things (for I must digest your Answers for you.) 1. *That there is no evidence, that A. C. borrowed this from Vincentius, and you give an excellent Reason for it, because good Wits may both hit on the same thing, or at least come near it; which, had it been said of your self, had been more unquestionable: But, to let that pass,* 2. *You tell us, That the Doctrine is true, whosoever said it. For which, you give this Reason. For the same Reason which permits not our questioning, or denying the prime Maxims of Faith, permits not our questioning, or denying any other Doctrine declared by the Church; because it is not the greatness or smallness of the matter, that moves us to give firm As-*

S. 9.

P. 38. n. 15.

n. 16.

P. 37.

sent

sent in Points of Faith; but the Authority of God speaking by the Church. To which I answer, that all this runs upon a Supposition false in it self, which is, That all our Assurance in Matters of Faith, depends upon the Infallible Authority of the present Church; which being granted, I would not deny, but supposing that Infallibility absolute, on the same reason I believe one thing on the Churches Authority, I must believe all. For the case were the same then, as to the Church, which we say, it is as to the Scriptures; he that believes any thing, on the account of its being contained in that Book as the Word of God, must believe every thing he is convinced to be therein contained, whether the matter be in it self small or great; because the ground of his Belief, is the Authority of God, revealing those things to us. And, if therefore you could prove such a Divine Authority, constantly resident in the Church, for determining all Matters of Faith, I grant your Consequence would hold: But that is too great a Boon to be had for Begging, and that is all the way you use for it here. If you offer to prove it afterwards, our Answers shall be ready to attend you. But at present, let it suffice to tell you, That we believe no Article of Faith at all upon the Churches Infallible Authority; and therefore, though we deny what the Church proposeth, it follows not that we are any more liable to question the truth of any Article any further than the Churches Authority reaches in it; i. e. we deny that any thing becomes an Article merely upon her account. But now, if you remove the Argument from the present Churches Infallible Authority, to the Universal Churches Testimony, we then tell you, That he who questions a clear, full, universal Tradition of the whole Church from Christ's time to this, will, by the same reason, doubt of all Matters of Faith, which are conveyed by this Testimony to us. But then we must further consider, That we are bound by virtue of the Churches Testimony, to believe nothing any further, than it appears to have been the constant, full, Universal Testimony of the Church, from the time of Christ and his Apostles. Whatever therefore you can make appear to have been received as a necessary Article of Faith in this manner, we embrace it, but nothing else; and on the other side, we say, That whoever doubts, or denies this Testimony, will doubt of all Matters of Faith, because the Ground and Rule of Faith, the Scriptures, is conveyed to us only through this Universal Tradition.

§. 10.
P. 37. D. 8. 3. You answer, That his Lordship mistakes Vincentius Lirinensis his meaning, and falsifies his Testimony thrice at least. Whereof the first is in rendring [*de Catholico dogmate*] of Catholick Maxims: And here a double most dreadful charge is drawn up against his Lordship; the first from the Accusation of Priscian, and the second of no less Authors, than Rider and the English Lexicons: The first is, for translating the Singular Number by the Plural; whereas our most Reverend Orbilius himself in the following Page, tells us, that this *Catholicum dogma*, Vincentius speaks of, contains the whole System of the Catholick Faith, and in that System some are Fundamentals, some Superstructures, (both Plurals) yet all these contained in this one singular Dogma: But it was his Lordship's great Mishap not to have his Education in the Schools of the Jesuites, else he might have escaped the *Lasb* for this most unpardonable oversight of rendring *verbum multitudinis* by our Author's own Confession (who makes it larger too than his Lordship doth; for his Lordship saith, it contains only Fundamentals, but our Author Superstructures too) by the Plural Number. But the second fault is worse than this; for, saith our Author very gravely and discreetly with his Rod in his hand, But in what Author learnt he, that Dogma signifies only Maxims, were it in the Plural Number? Dogma, according to our English Lexicons, Rider, and others, signifies a Decree, or com-

mon received Opinion, whether in prime, or less principal Matters. What a learned Dispute are we now fallen into ? But I see you were resolved to put all but *Boys* and *Pedagogues* out of all likelihood of confuting you ; for those are only the Persons among us, who deal in *Rider* and *English Lexicons*. I see now, there is some hopes, that the Orders of the *Inquisition* may have better *Latin*, than that against Mr. *White* had ; since our old *Jesuites* begin to be so well versed in such Masters of the *Latin* tongue. How low is *Infallibility* fallen, that we must appeal for knowing what *Dogma fidei* is, to the Definition not of *Popes* and *Councils*, but of *Rider* and *English Lexicons* ? But it is ill jesting with our *Orbilius* in so severe a humour, that his *Grace of Canterbury* cannot scape his *Laish* for not consulting *Rider's Dictionary* for the signification of *Dogma*. But our Author passeth, and we must attend him, out of his *Grammatical* into the *Theological School* ; and there tells us, That the Ecclesiastical Signification of *Dogma*, extends it self to all things *Established* in the Church, as Matters of Faith, whether *Fundamentals* or *Superstructures* ; and for this, *Scotus* is cited (somewhat a better Author than *Rider*) who calls *Transubstantiation*, *Dogma fidei*. I begin to believe now, that *Dogma* is a very large word, and *Fides* much larger, that can hold so prodigious a thing as *Transubstantiation* within them. But, notwithstanding what *Rider* and *Scotus* say, none so able to explain *Vincentius* his meaning, as *Vincentius* himself. To him therefore at last our Author appeals and tells us, That he declares in other places, that he means by *Dogma* such things as in general belong to *Christian Faith* without distinction. But doth *Vincentius* any where by *Dogma* mean any such things which were not judged necessary by the ancient and Primitive Church, but become necessary to be believed upon the Churches Definitions ? Nothing can possibly be imagined more directly contrary to the design of this whole Book than that is, when he appeals still for Matters to be believed to *Antiquity*, *Universality*, and *Consent* ; and to be sure, all these are required to whatever he means by a *Dogma fidei* : If you therefore can produce any Testimonies out of his Book, which can be supposed in the least to favour the Power of the Church in her new Definitions of Matters of Faith, you may justly challenge to your self the name of an excellent Invention, who can find that in his Book, which all other Persons find the directly contrary to. Your first Citation is out of ch. 33. (not 23. as you quote it, or some one else for you) where he is explaining what St. Paul means by *Prophanas vocum novitates*. *Vocum*, saith he, i. e. *Dogmatum, rerum, sententiarum novitates ; quæ sunt vetustati, quæ antiquitati contrariæ*. I shall not scruple to grant you that *Vincentius* by *Dogmata* here, doth mean such things as the Definitions of your Church are, for he speaks of those things, which all Christians, who have a care of their Salvation, are to avoid ; of such things as are contrary to all *Antiquity* ; and such kind of *Dogmata*, I freely grant the Definitions of your Church to be. Your second Citation is as happy as the first, cap. 28. *Crescat* (saith he, speaking of the Church) *sed in suo duntaxat genere, in eodem scilicet Dogmate, eodem sensu, eademque sententiâ*. An excellent place, no doubt, to prove it in the Churches power to define new Articles of Faith ; because the Church must always remain in the same Belief, Sense, and Opinion. When his words but little foregoing are, *Profectus sit ille fidei non permutatio*, which without the help of *English Lexicons* you would willingly render by leaving out that troublesome Particle *non*, that the best progress in Faith is by adding new Articles, though it be as contrary to Reason as it is to the sense of *Vincentius Lirinensis*. If *Vincentius* saith, that the *Pelagians* erred in *Dogmate fidei* (which words nei-

ther appear *cap. 24. nor 34.*) he gives this reason for it, because they contradict the *Universal Sense of Antiquity*, and the *Catholick Church, cap. 34.* So that still *Vincentius*, where-ever he speaks of this *Dogma fidei*, speaks in direct opposition to your sense of it, for new Definitions of the Church in Matters of Faith. There being scarce any Book extant which doth more designedly overthrow this Opinion of yours, than that of *Vincentius* doth.

§. II. To shew therefore how much you have wronged his Lordship, and what little advantage comes to your cause by your insisting on *Vincentius* his Testimony: I shall give a brief account both of his Design and Book. The design of it, is, to shew what ways one should use to prevent being deceived, by such who pretend to discover new Matters of Faith, and those he assigns to be these two, settling one's Faith, on the Authority of
Commonit. 1. c. 1. *Scripture, and the Tradition of the Catholick Church.* But since Men would enquire, the Canon of Scripture being perfect, and abundantly sufficient for all things, what need can there be of Ecclesiastical Tradition? He answers, For
Cap. 2. finding out the true Sense of Scripture, which is diversly interpreted, by *Novatianus, Photinus, Sabellius, Donatus, Arius, Eunomius, Macedonius, Apollinaris, &c.* In the following Chapter, he tells us, what he means by this Ecclesiastical Tradition, *Quod ubique, quod semper, ab omnibus creditum est*, that which hath Antiquity, Universality, and Consent, joyning in the belief of it. And can any new Definitions of the Church pretend to all, or any of these? He after enquires, what is to be done in case a particular Church separates it self from the Communion of the Catholick? He answers, We ought to prefer the Health of the whole Body, before any pestiferous or corrupted Member. But in case any Novel Contagion should spread over, not a part only, but endanger the whole Church? then, saith he, a Man must adhere to Antiquity, which cannot be deceived with a pretence of Novelty. But if in Antiquity, we find out the Error of two or three particular Persons, or City, or Province; what is then to be done? then, saith he, the Decrees of General Councils are to be preferred: But in case there be none? Then he adds, The general consent of the most approved Writers of the Church is to be enquired after; and what they all with one consent, openly, frequently, constantly held, writ, and taught, that let every Man look on himself as bound to believe without hesitation. Now then, prove but any one of the new Articles of Faith in the *Tridentine Confession* by these Rules of *Vincentius*; and it will appear, that you have produced his Testimony to some purpose: Else nothing will be more strong and forcible against all your Pretences, than this discourse of *Vincentius* is; which he enlarges by the Examples of the *Donatists, Arrians*, and others, in the following Chapters; in which still his scope is to assert Antiquity, and condemn all Novelty in Matters of Faith under any Pretext whatsoever. For this, *Ch. 12, 14.* he cites a multitude of Texts of Scripture; forbidding our following any other Doctrine, but what was delivered by Christ and his Apostles; and Anathematizing all such as should Preach any other Gospel: And concludes that, with this remarkable Speech; *It never was, never is, never will be, lawful to propose any thing (as Matter of Faith) to Christian Catholicks, besides what they have received. And it was, is, and will be becoming Christians to Anathematize all such who declare any thing but what they have received.* Do you

Nihil novandum nisi quod traditum est. Nosq; religionem, non quâ vellemus ducere, sed quâ illa duceret, sequi oportere. Idque esse proprium Christianæ modestiæ & gravitatis, non sua posteris tradere, sed à majoribus accepta servare. cap. 9.

Adnunciare ergo aliquid Christianis Catholicis præter id quod acceperunt, nunquam licuit, nunquam licet, nunquam licebit: sed Anathematizare eos qui Adnunciant aliquid, præterquam quod semel acceptum est, nunquam non oportuit, nusquam non oportet, nusquam non oportebit. Vincent. Lerin. cap. 14.

think this Man was not of your mind in the Doctrine of Fundamentals?

tals? Could he do otherwise than believe it in the *Churches Power* to define things necessary to Salvation, who would have all those *Anathematized*, who pretend to declare any thing as Matter of Faith, but what they received as such from their *Ancestors*? And after he hath at large exemplified this in the *Photinian*, *Nestorian*, *Apollinarian* Heresies, and shewed how little the *Authority* of private *Doctors*, how excellent soever, is to be relied on in Matters of Faith; he concludes again with this, *Whatsoever the Catholick Church held universally, that, and that alone is to be held by particular Persons.* And after admires at the *Madness*, *Blindness*, *Pervereness* of those, who are not contented with the once delivered and ancient Rule of Faith; but are still seeking new things, and always are itching to add, alter, take away, something of Religion (or Matter of Faith) as though that were not a Heavenly Doctrine, which may suffice to be once revealed; but an Earthly Institution, which cannot be perfect, but by continual Correction and Amendment. Is not this Man now a fit Person to explain the sense of your Churches new Definitions, and Declarations in Matters of Faith? And have not you hit very right on this sense of *Dogma*, when here he understands by it that *Doctrine of Faith*, which is not capable of any Addition or Alteration? And thus we understand sufficiently what he means by the present controverted place; that if Men reject any part of the Catholick Doctrine, they may as well refuse another, and another, till at last they reject all. By the Catholick Doctrine, or *Catholicum dogma*, there he means the same with the *Cæleste dogma* before, and by both of them understands that Doctrine of Faith which was once revealed by God, and which is capable of no Addition at all, having *Antiquity*, *Universality*, and *Consent*, going along with it; and when you can prove that this *Catholicum Dogma*, doth extend beyond those things which his Lordship calls *Catholick Maxims*, or properly *Fundamental Truths*, you will have done something to the purpose, which as yet you have failed in. And thus we say, *Vincentius* his Rule is good, though we do not say, that he was *infallible* in the Application of it, but that he might mention some such things to have had *Antiquity*, *Universality*, and *Consent* which had not so, such as the business of not *Re-baptizing Hereticks*, and the Observation of *Easter*, which you instance in. And withall we add, though nothing is to be admitted for Matter of Faith which wants those three Marks, yet some things may have all three of them, and yet be no Matters of Faith at all; and therefore not at all pertinent to this question; such as those things are which you insist on, as *deposita dogmata*; which doubtless is a rare way of Probation, viz. to shew that by *dogmata deposita*, *Vincentius* means some *Articles of Faith* which are not *Fundamental* in the matter of them; and for that make choice of such Instances which are no Matters of Faith at all: But either ritual Traditions, or Matters of Order, such as the *Form and Matter of Sacraments*, the *Hierarchy of the Church*, *Pædobaptism*, not *Re-baptizing Hereticks*, the perpetual *Virginity of the Virgin Mary*. For that of the *Canon of Scripture*, it will be elsewhere considered, as likewise those other *Church-traditions*.

How the Church should still keep, *hoc idem quod antea*, as you confess she ought, and yet make some things necessary to be believed by all, which before her Declaration were not so, is somewhat hard to conceive; and yet both

Quicquid universaliter antiquitus Ecclesiæ Catholicæ tenuisse cognoverit, id solum sibi tenendum, credendumque decernit. cap. 25. Mirari satis nequeo tantam quorundam hominum vesaniam, tantam excacatæ mentis impietatem, tantum postremo errandi libidinem, ut contenti non sint traditâ semel acceptâ antiquitus credendi regulâ; sed nova & nova in diem querunt, semperque aliquid gestiunt religioni addere, mutare, detrabere. Quasi non cæleste dogma sit, quod semel revelatum esse sufficiat; sed terrena institutio, quæ aliter perfici nisi assiduâ emendatione, immo potius reprehensione, non possit. cap. 26.

Abdicatâ enim qualibet parte Catholici dogmatis, alia quoque item atq; alia, &c. quid aliud ad extremum sequetur, nisi ut totum pariter repudietur? cap. 31.

these you assert together. Is that which is necessary to be believed by all, the same with that which was not necessary to be so believed? If the same measure of Faith will not serve after, which would have done before, is there not an alteration made? Yes, you grant, *as to our believing, but not as to the thing, for that is the same it was.* But do you in the mean time consider what kind of thing that is which you speak of, which is a thing propounded to be believed, and considered in no other respect, but as it is revealed by God in order to our believing it; now when the same thing which was required only to be believed implicitly, *i. e.* not at all necessarily, is now propounded to be believed expressly and necessarily; the *Fundamental* nature of it, as an *Object of Faith*, is altered. For that which you call *implicit Faith*, doth really imply as to all those things to be believed implicitly, that there is an indifference, whether they be believed or no; nothing being necessary to be believed, but what is propounded to be expressly believed: Which being so, Can it be imagined there should be a greater alteration in a Matter of Faith, than from its being indifferent whether it were believed or no, to become necessary to be expressly believed by all in order to Salvation? And where there is such an alteration as this in the thing-to-be-believed, who can without the help of a very commodious implicit Faith believe, that still this is *hoc idem quod antea*, the very same as a Matter of Faith, which it was before? Though the Church were careful to preserve every *Iota* and *Tittle* of Sacred Doctrines; yet I hope it follows not, that every *Iota* and *Tittle* is of as much consequence, and as necessary to be believed, as the main substance of *Christian Doctrine*. Although when any Doctrine was violently opposed in the Church she might declare her owning it by some Overt Act: Yet thence it doth not follow, that the *Internal Assent* to every thing so declared is as necessary, as to that Proposition, that *Jesus is the Son of God*, the belief of which the Scripture tells us was the main design of the writing of Scripture. That General Councils, rightly proceeding, may be great helps to the Faith of Christians, I know none that deny; but that by virtue of their Definitions any thing becomes necessary to be believed, which was not so before, remains yet to be proved.

S. 13.
P. 39.

You much wonder his Lordship should Father that Saying on *Vincentius*, That, *If new Doctrines be added to the old, the Church, which is Sacramentum veritatis, the Repository of Verity, may be changed in Lupanar errorum, which, his Lordship saith, he is loth to English:* For you tell us, That *Vincentius* is so far from entertaining the least thought of it, that he presently adds, *Deus avertat, God forbid it should be so.* A stout Inference! Just as if one should say, The Church of Rome may be in time overspread with the *Mahometan Religion*, but God forbid it should be so; Were he not an excellent Disputer, who should hence infer it *impossible* ever to be so? What you add out of *Vincentius*, only proves, that he did not believe it was so in his time, but doth not in the least prove, that he believed it *impossible* that ever it should be so afterwards; but notwithstanding all that you say, it is evident enough, that *Vincentius* believed it a very supposable Case, by

Quid si novella aliqua contagio non jam portiunculam tantum, sed totam pariter Ecclesiam commaculare conetur? tunc item providet, ut antiquitati inbareat. cap. 4.

that Question he puts elsewhere. *What if any new contagion doth not only endeavour to defile a part only, but the whole Church? In which* he saith, *we are to adhere to Antiquity.* If you answer, he speaks only of an *Endeavour*: It is soon replied, That he speaks of *such an Endeavour* as puts Men to dispute a Question, what they are to do in such a Case, and he resolves at that time, they are not to adhere to the judgment of the *present Church*,

Church, but to that of *Antiquity*, which is all we desire in that Case, viz. That the *present Church* may so far add to Matters of Faith, that we can in no reason be obliged to rely only upon her judgment. Wherein we are to consider, the *Question* is not of that you call the *diffusive*, but the *representative Church*, all which may be overspread, and yet but a part of the other; but yet if that *Church*, whose judgment you say only is to be relied on may be so infected, it is all one as to those who are to be guided by her judgment, whether the *other* be or no. For here *eadem est ratio non entis & non apparentis*, because it is not the Reality, but the Manifestation which is the Ground of Men's relying on the *Churches* judgment. So that if as to all outward appearance, and all *Judicial Acts* of the *Church*, she may recede from the ancient Faith, and add *novitia veteribus*, (whether all particular Persons in it do so or no) all ground of relying on the judgment of that *Church*, is thereby taken away. Whether it be the *Church* her self, or *Hereticks in the Church* which make these *Additions*, is very little material, if these *Hereticks*, who add these *new Articles of Faith*, may carry themselves so cunningly, as to get themselves the Reputation of the *Catholick Church*: And so that which ought to have been *Sacrarium veritatis*, may become *impiorum & turpium errorum Lupanar*: Which your *Church* is concerned not to have *Englished*; but by the help of *Rider*, and other good *Authors* of yours, it is no hard matter to come to understand it. And thus we see how much you have abused his Lordship, in charging him with a three-fold Falsification of *Vincentius Lirinensis*.

The second thing which his Lordship answers, is, *That all Determinations of the Church are not made firm to us by one and the same Divine Revelation*; because some are made by *Scripture*, and others, as *Stapleton* saith, without any evident or probable *Testimony of Holy Writ*: Though therein *Belarmine* falls quite off, and confesses in express Terms, that nothing can be certain by certainty of Faith, unless it be contained immediately in the Word of God; or be deduced thence by evident Consequence. Your only design here, is, to vindicate your two great Champions from contradicting each other, which though it be of little Consequence to the main Assertion of his Lordship, which you knew well enough, and therefore carefully avoid the main Charge of your Enemy, to part two of your quarrelling Friends: Yet since you intend this for a Tryal of your Skill, we must see how well you play your Prize. *Stapleton*, say you, means that we must submit to the Determinations of the Church, and the Traditions she approves, though they be not expressly contained in *Scripture*. Excellently well guessed at *Stapleton's* meaning! when the very words you cite out of him are, *We ought not to deny our Assent in Matters of Faith, though we have them only by Tradition, or the Decisions of the Church against Hereticks, and not confirmed with evident or probable Testimony of Scripture*. What a rare Interpreter are you grown since your acquaintance with *Rider*, and other *English Lexicons*? Who make not denying Assent in Matters of Faith, to be the same with submitting to the Churches Determinations, when you know well enough, we plead for Submission to the Churches Determinations, where there may be a liberty as to internal Assent: And it is as good to make no evident or probable Testimony of Scripture the same with not being expressly contained in *Scripture*; as though nothing which was not expressly contained in *Scripture*, could have any probable Testimony from thence. And from this we may guess what an easie matter it is for you to accommodate all Persons who differ, if one says *Yes*, and the other *No*, you will tell them they do not differ, but that one of them by *Yes*, means *No*, and the other by

- by No, means Yes. Just so here you reconcile Stapleton and Bellarmine; for you say, Stapleton by [no probable Testimony] means some kind of probable Testimony, viz. such as though not express, may be yet deduced from Scripture; and Bellarmine, when he speaks of God's written Word, as the Ground of Certainty, means that which is neither God's Word, nor yet written, viz. Tradition. I never met with one who had a better faculty of reconciling than you seem to have by this attempt. But his Lordship had prevented this Subterfuge as to Bellarmine and Stapleton, as if Stapleton spake of the Word of God Written, and Bellarmine of the Word of God unwritten (as he calls Tradition.) For Bellarmine, saith he, *there treats of the Knowledge which a Man hath of the certainty of his own Salvation. And I hope A. C. will not tell us there's any Tradition extant unwritten, by which particular Men may have assurance of their several Salvations. Therefore Bellarmine's whole Disputation there, is quite beside the matter: Or else, he must speak of the written Word, and so lie cross to Stapleton, as is mention'd.* You tell us, This Reason is very strange: But I dare say, yours exceeds it in strangeness, which is, because Bellarmine's design was to shew, there was no such unwritten Tradition to be found. But doth Bellarmine dispute against any body or no body? If he disputes against any body upon your Principles, those whom he disputes against must be such, who assert that Men may have certainty of Faith concerning their Salvation from Tradition; and you would do well to tell us, who those were that pretended that there was a Tradition or unwritten Word delivered down from the Apostles, that they should be saved. And though Bellarmine was not to affirm this, yet those he disputed against, upon your Principles must be supposed to do it. But certainly you thought none of your Readers did ever intend to look into Bellarmine for the place in Controversie; for if they did, nothing could be more plain, than that Bellarmine's Reason against Catharinus and others, proceeds wholly and only upon the written Word. For, 1. When he saith, that *Nothing can be certain with the certainty of Faith, but what is either immediately contained in the Word of God, or may be deduced thence by evident consequence, because Faith can rest on nothing, but the Authority of God's Word*; he adds, *That of this Principle, neither the Catholics nor the Hereticks doubt.* But I pray, do those whom Bellarmine there calls Hereticks, acknowledge the unwritten Word as a Foundation for the certainty of Faith in the Case Disputed? Therefore it is plain, he speaks exclusively of a written Word. 2. When he mentions the Assumption, he evidently explains himself of the written Word; for, saith he, *There is no such Proposition contained in the Word of God, that such and such a particular Person is justified; for there are none mentioned therein, save Mary Magdalen, and a certain Paralytick, of whom it is said, their Sins are forgiven them. Ceteri homines in sacris literis ne nominantur quidem.* And will Rider, and your other good Friends the English Lexicons, help you to interpret *Sacra litera* by unwritten Traditions? Could any one that had either any common Sense left in him, or else had not a design most grossly to impose on his Readers, offer to perswade Men, that Bellarmine could here understand the Word of God in a Sense common to Scripture and Tradition. If you can prove that Bellarmine saith otherwise elsewhere, you are so far from reconciling Bellarmine and Stapleton, that you will not easily reconcile Bellarmine to himself.
- P. 43, 44. The remainder of this Chapter either refers to something to be handled afterwards, as the *Infallibility of the Church and Councils*, or else barely repeats what hath been discussed already concerning your sense of *Fundamentals*, and there-

Bellarmino
justific. l. 3.
c. 8. sect. 2.

therefore I dare not presume so far on the Reader's Patience, as to give him the same things over and over.

138.1.6.

CHAP. IV.

The Protestant Doctrine of Fundamentals vindicated.

The unreasonableness of demanding a Catalogue of Fundamentals. The Creed contains the Fundamentals of Christian Communion. The belief of Scripture supposed by it. The Dispute concerning the Sense of Christ's Descent into Hell, and Mr. Rogers his Book confessed by T. C. impertinent: With others of the same nature. T. C.'s Fraud, in citing his Lordship's words. Of Papists and Protestants Unity. The Moderation of the Church of England, compared with that of Rome. Her grounds of Faith justified. Infant-Baptism how far proved out of Scripture alone.

THis Chapter begins with a very pertinent Question, as you call it: We might the easier believe it to be so, because it is none of your own proposing; but yet your very calling it, a pertinent Question, renders it liable to suspicion, and upon examination, it will be found both unreasonable and impertinent. The Question was, *What Points the Bishop would account Fundamental*; and that you may shew how necessary this Question was, you add; *For if he will have some Fundamental, which we are bound to believe under pain of Damnation; and others not Fundamental, which we may, without Sin, question, or deny; it behoves us much to know, what they are. I have ever desired, say you, a satisfactory Answer from Protestants to this Question, but could never yet have it in the sense demanded.* An unhappy Man you are, who, it seems, have in your time propounded more foolish Questions, than a great many wise Men were ever able to answer. But, is it not every jot as reasonable, That since your Church pretends to the power of making things necessary to the Salvation of all, which were not so before, we should have from you an exact Catalogue of all your Churches Definitions? If for that, you refer us to the Confession of Faith, at the end of the Council of Trent; so may not we, with far greater reason, send you back to the Apostolical Creed? There being no Objection which will hold against this being a Catalogue of our Fundamentals, but will hold against that being a Catalogue of yours. Nay, you assert such things your self concerning the necessity of believing things defined by the Church, as make it impossible for you to assign the definite number of such things, as are necessary for all Persons, and therefore it is very unreasonable to demand it of us. For still, when you speak, that the things defined by the Church, are necessary to the Salvation of all, you add, *Where they are sufficiently propounded*; so that the Measure of Fundamentals depends on the sufficiency of the Proposition. Now, will you undertake to assign what number of things are sufficiently propounded to the belief of all Persons? Can you set down the exact bounds, as to all Individuals, when their Ignorance is inexcusable, and when not? Can you tell what the measure of their Capacity was? What allowance God makes for the Prejudices of Education, where there is a Mind desirous of Instruction? Will you say, God accounts all those things sufficiently proposed to Men's Belief, which you judge to be so? Or, that all Men are bound to think those things necessary to Salvation, which you

you think so ? By what means shall the *Churches* Power of defining Matters of Faith, be sufficiently proposed to Men as an Article of Faith ? Either by its own Definition, or without ? If by it ; the thing is proposed to be believed, which is supposed to be believed already, before that Proposition ; or else the Enquiry returns with as great force, Why should I believe that Definition more than any other ? If without it ; then the sufficiency of Proposition, and the necessity of Believing depends not on the *Churches* Definition. These Questions I am apt to think *as pertinent and necessary* as yours was : And, now you know my Sense, and are so discontented you could never meet with a satisfactory Answer from *Protestants*, prevent the same dissatisfaction in me, by giving a punctual Answer to such necessary Questions. But, if you think the Demands *unreasonable*, because they depend on such things, which none can know but God himself ; I pray accept of that as a satisfactory Answer to your own *very pertinent Question*.

§. 2.

P. 42. Sect.
11. n. 1.

But if the Question be propounded not concerning *what things are Fundamental and necessary to particular Persons*, which on the Reasons formerly given, it is impossible to give a Catalogue of, but, *of such things which are necessary to be owned for Christian Communion*, as I have shewed this Question of *Fundamentals* ought only to be taken here ; then his Lordship's Answer was more pertinent than the Question, *viz. That all the Points of the Creed were such : For*, saith he, *Since the Fathers make the Creed the Rule of Faith ; since the agreeing Sense of Scripture, with those Articles, are the two regular Precepts, by which a Divine is governed about the Faith ; since your own Council of Trent decrees, That it is that Principle of Faith, in which all that profess Christ, do necessarily agree, & Fundamentum firmum & unicum, not the firm only, but the only Foundation ; since it is Excommunication ipso jure, for any Man to contradict the Articles contained in that Creed ; since the whole Body of Faith is so contained in the Creed, as that the substance of it was believed even before the coming of Christ ; though not so expressly as since, in the number of the Articles: Since Bellarmine confesses, That all things simply necessary for all Men's Salvation, are in the Creed and Decalogue, What reason can you have to except ? Thus far his Lordship. Though from hence it appears, what little reason you have to except ; yet because of that, I expect your Exceptions the sooner : And therefore very fairly passing by the Sense of the *Fathers*, you ask concerning the Council of Trent ; *What if, that call the Creed the only Foundation ?* Are you come to a *What if*, with the Council of Trent ? But I suppose, it is not from *disputing its Authority*, but *its meaning* ; for you would seem to understand it only *of prime Articles of Faith, and not of such as all are bound upon sufficient Proposition expressly to believe* ; for that is all the sense I can make of your words. But, whoever was so silly, as to say, that all such things which are to be believed on *sufficient Proposition* that they are revealed by God, are contained in the Creed ? When you seem to imply, That this was the Sense the Question was propounded in, it is a sign you little attend to the Consequence of things : When it is most evident, that the *Question* was started concerning the *Greek Church*, and therefore must refer only to such *Fundamentals*, as are necessary to be owned in order to the *Being of a true Church*. And when you can prove, that any other Articles are necessary to that, besides those contained in the *Creed*, you will do something to purpose, but not before. But, you suppose *them to take the Creed in a very large sense, who would lay up in the folds of it all particular Points of Faith whatever* : And I am sure, this is not the sense it is to be taken in here ; nor that in which his Lordship took it. He saith indeed, *That if he had said, that those Articles only which are**

P. 44.

expressed

expressed in the Creed, are Fundamental, it would have been hard to have excluded the Scripture, upon which the Creed it self in every Point is grounded. For nothing is supposed to shut out its own Foundation. And this is built on very good reason. For the things contained in the Creed are proposed as matters to be believed; all Faith must suppose a Divine Testimony revealing those things to us, as the ground on which we believe them; this Divine Testimony is never pretended to be contained in the Creed; but that it is only a summary Collection of the most necessary Points which God hath revealed; and therefore something else must be supposed as the ground and formal reason why we assent to the truth of those things therein contained. So that the Creed must suppose the Scripture, as the main and only Foundation of believing the matters of Faith therein contained. But say you, *If all the Scripture be included in the Creed, there appears no great reason of scruple, why the same should not be said of Traditions, and other Points; especially of that for which we admit Scripture it self.* But, do you make no difference between the Scripture being supposed as the ground of Faith, and all Scripture being contained in the Creed? And doth not his Lordship tell you, *That though some Articles may be Fundamental, which are infolded in the Creed, it would not follow, that therefore some unwritten Traditions were Fundamental; for, though they may have Authority, and use, in the Church, as Apostolical, yet are they not Fundamental in the Faith.* And as for that Tradition, *That the Books of Holy Scripture are Divine, and Infalible in every part;* he promises to handle it, when he comes to the proper place for it. And there we shall readily attend what you have to object to what his Lordship saith about it.

But yet you say, *His Lordship doth not answer the Question, as far as it was necessary to be answered;* we say, he doth. No, say you: *For the Question arising concerning the Greek Churches error, whether it were Fundamental or no; Mr. Fisher demanded of the Bishop, What Points he would account Fundamental: to which he answers, That all Points contained in the Creed, are such, but yet not only they; and therefore this was no direct Answer to the Question; for, though the Greeks error was not against the Creed, yet it may be against some other Fundamental Article not contained in the Creed.* This you call *fine shuffling.* To which I answer, That when his Lordship spake of its not being *Fundamentum unicum* in that sense, to exclude all things not contained in the Creed from being Fundamental; he spake it with an immediate respect to the belief of Scripture, as an *Infalible Rule of Faith:* For, saith he, *The truth is, I said, and say still, That all the Points of the Apostles Creed, as they are there expressed, are Fundamental.* And herein I say no more than some of your best learned have said before me. But, I never said or meant, *that they only are Fundamental; that they are Fundamentum unicum, is the Council of Trents, 'tis not mine.* Mine is, *That the belief of Scripture to be the word of God and Infalible, is an equal, or rather a Preceding Principle of Faith, with, or to, the whole body of the Creed.* Now, what reason can you have to call this shuffling, unless you will rank the Greeks error equal with the denying the Scripture to be the Word of God? otherwise, his Lordships Answer is as full and pertinent, as your cavil is vain and trifling. His Lordship adds, *That this agrees with one of your own great Masters, Albertus Magnus, who is not far from the Proposition, in terminis.* To which your Exceptions are so pitiful, that I shall answer them without reciting them; for he that supposes the sense of Scripture, joyned with the Articles of Faith, to be the Rule of Faith, as *Albertus* doth, must certainly suppose the belief of the Scripture as the

Word of God, else how is it possible its sense should be the Rule of Faith? Again, it is not enough, for you to say, That he believed other Articles of Faith, besides those in the *Creed*, but, that he made them a Rule of Faith together with the sense of Scripture. 3. All this while here is not one word of Tradition, as the ground on which these Articles of Faith were to be believed. If this therefore be your way of answering, I know none will contend with you for *sine shuffling*. What follows concerning the right sense of the Article of the *Descent of Christ into Hell*; since you say, *You will not much trouble your self about it, as being not Fundamental either in his Lordships sense, or ours*; I look on that expression as sufficient to excuse me from undertaking so needless a trouble, as the examining the several senses of it; since you acknowledge, *That no one determinate sense is Fundamental*, and therefore not pertinent to our business. Much less is that which follows concerning Mr. Rogers *his Book and Authority*; in which, and that which depends upon it, I shall only give you your own words for an Answer, *That truly I conceive it of small importance to spend much time upon this subject*; and shall not so far contradict my judgment as to do that, which, I think, when it is done, is to very little purpose. Of the same nature is that of *Catharinus*; for it signifies nothing to us, whether you account him an *Heretick* or no, who know, Men are not one jot more or less *Hereticks*, for your accounting them to be so or not.

§ 4.
P. 46. n. 4. You call the *Bishop*, your good friend, in saying, *That all Protestants do agree with the Church of England in the main Exceptions, which they joyntly take against the Roman Church, as appears by their several Confessions*. For (say you) *by their agreeing in this, but in little or nothing else, they sufficiently shew themselves enemies to the true Church, which is one, and only one, by Unity of Doctrine*; from whence they must needs be judged to depart, by reason of their *Divisions*. As good a friend as you say his Lordship was to you, in that saying of his, I am sure you ill requite him for his *Kindness*, by so palpable a falsification of his words, and abuse of his meaning. And all that *Friendship* you pretend, lies only in your leaving out that part of the Sentence, which takes away all that you build on the rest. For where doth his Lordship say, *That the Protestants only agree in their main Exceptions against the Roman Church, and not in their Doctrines*? Nay, doth he not expressly say, *That they agree in the chiefest Doctrines, as well as main Exceptions, which they take against the Church of Rome, as appears by their several Confessions*? But you, very conveniently to your purpose, and with a *fraud* suitable to your Cause, leave out the first part of agreement in the chiefest Doctrines, and mention only the latter, lest your Declamation should be spoiled as to your *Unity*, and our Disagreements. But we see by this, by what means you would persuade men of both, by Arts and Devices, fit only to deceive such, who look only on the appearance and outsides of things; and yet even there, he that sees not your growing *Divisions*, is a great stranger to the Christian world. Your great Argument
P. 47. n. 4. of the *Unity* of your party, because, *whatever the private Opinions of men are, they are ready to submit their judgments to the censure and determination of the Church*; if it be good, will hold as well (or better) for our *Unity*, as yours, because all men are willing to submit their judgments to Scripture, which is agreed on all sides to be *Infallible*. If you say, *That it cannot be known what Scripture determines, but it may be easily what the Church defines*: It is easily answered, that the event shews it to be far otherwise; for how many Disputes are there, concerning the *Power* of determining matters of Faith? to whom it belongs, in what way it must be managed, whether

whether Parties ought to be heard in Matters of Doctrine, what the meaning of the *Decrees* are, when they are made, which raise as many Divisions as were before them, as appears by the *Decrees* of the Council of Trent, and the latter of *Pope Innocent* relating to the *five Propositions*: So that upon the whole it appears, setting aside Force and Fraud (which are excellent Principles of *Christian Unity*) we are upon as fair Terms of *Union* as you are among your selves.

You tell us, *That your Church doth Anathematize only such Persons as are obstinate*; but who are they whom she accounts obstinate? Even all who dissent from her in any *Punctilio*. And therefore this is a singular piece of Moderation in your Church. And, you believe the Troubles of Christendom rather come from too great freedom taken in Matters of Faith, than from any Severity in the Church of Rome. The truth is, you have excellent ways of ending Controversies, much like perswading Men to put out their Eyes, to end the Disputes about the nature of Colours; and if they will not hearken to such prudent Counsel, they are pronounced *Obstinate* and *Perverse*, for offering to keep their Eyes in their Heads. And if Men will not say, that *White is Black*, when your Church bids them do it, these Men are the *troublers of Israel*, and the Fomenters of the *Discords* of the *Christian World*. But if your Church had kept to the primitive Simplicity and Moderation, and not offered to define Matters of Faith; the occasion of most of the Controversies of the *Christian World* had been taken away. Believe what you will, and speak what you list; there are none who consider what they believe or speak, but easily discover whence the great Dissentions of the Christian World have risen, viz. from the *Ambition* and *Usurpation* of the Church of Rome, which hath not been contented to have introduced many silly Superstitions into the publick Exercise of Devotion; but, when any of these came to be discovered, thought it her best course to defend her Corruptions with greater; by inforcing Men to the belief of them, and thereby rendring a Separation from her Communion unavoidable by all those who sought to retrieve the Piety and Devotion of the Primitive Church. And yet this must be call'd *Schism*, and Persons attempting it *Hereticks*, by that same *Pious and Tender-hearted Mother of yours*, who loves her Children so dearly, that if they do but desire any Reformation of Abuses, she takes all possible care they shall complain no more. As though the only way to prevent quarelling in the World, were to cut out Peoples Tongues, and cut off their Arms; such a kind of *Unity* hath your Church shewed her self very desirous of, where-ever Power and Conveniency have met for the carrying it on. But, I hope, you will give us leave, not to envy the *Unity* of those, who therefore agree in the Church, because, as soon as they do in the least differ from it, they are pronounced not to be of it, for opposing the Determinations of it. And yet, notwithstanding, the Violence and Fraud used in your Church to preserve its *Unity*, the World is alarm'd with the noise of its Dissentions, and the increase of the differing Parties, who manage their Contests with great Heats and Animosities against each other, under all the great Pretences of your *Unity*. I cannot but therefore judge it a very prudent Expression of his Lordship, *That as the Church of England is not such a Shrew to her Children, as to deny her Blessing, or denounce an Anathema against them, if some peaceably dissent in some particulars remoter from the Foundation*: So, if the Church of Rome, since she grew to her Greatness, had not been so fierce in this course, and too particular in determining too many things, and making them Matters of necessary Belief, which had gone for many hundred of Years before, only for things of pious Opinion;

P. 49. nion; Christendom (*I perswade my self*) had been in happier Peace at this day, than, I doubt, we shall ever live to see it. And it is an excellent Reason you give, why the Church of Rome doth impose her Doctrine on the whole World, under pain of Damnation; *because it is not in her power to do otherwise.* There is little hopes then of amendment in her, if she thinks so. But, you tell us, *Christ hath commanded her to do it.* What hath he commanded her to do? To add to his Doctrine by making things necessary, which he never made to be so? Is it in that place, where he bids the *Apostles, to teach all that he commanded them,* that he gives power to the Church, *to teach more than he commanded?* But this is a new kind of Supererogation, to make more Articles of Faith, than ever Men were required to make. Where still is this Command extant in Scripture? Not sure any where, but in that most apposite place produced to that, and all other good purposes which have nothing else to prove them; even *Dic Ecclesia, If he will not hear the Church, let him be to thee as a Heathen and a Publican;* therefore the Church of Rome is commanded by Christ, to impose her Doctrine on the whole Church, upon pain of Damnation. Sure you will pronounce Men obstinate, that dare in the least question this, after so irrefragable a demonstration of it. And you may well cry, *Scripture is not fit to decide Controversies,* when you consider the lame Consequences, you, above all Men, derive from it.

§. 6.
P. 51. n. 2. His Lordship shews the Moderation of the Church of England, even in that Canon which A. C. looks on as the most severe, where she pronounces Excommunication on such as affirm, that the Articles are in any part Superstitious or Erroneous, &c. by these things. 1. *That it is not meant of Men's private judgments, but of what they boldly and publicly affirm.* 2. *That it is one thing to hold contrary to some part of an Article; and another, positively to affirm, That the Articles in any part are Superstitious or Erroneous.* 3. *The Church of England doth this only for thirty nine Articles; but the Church of Rome doth it, for above a hundred in matter of Doctrine.* 4. *The Church of England never declared, That every one of her Articles are Fundamental in the Faith; but the Church of Rome requires, that all be believed as Fundamental, when once the Church hath determined them.* 5. *The Church of England prescribes only to her own Children, and by those Articles provides but for her own peaceable consent in those Doctrines of Truth. But the Church of Rome severely imposes her Doctrine upon the whole World, under pain of Damnation.* To all these very considerable Instances of our Churches Moderation, your Answer is, *The Question is not, Whether the English Congregation, or the Roman Church be more severe; but, Whether the English Protestants Severity be not unreasonable; supposing she be subject to Error in defining those Articles.* For after many other words to the same, i. e. little purpose, the Reason you give for it, is, *That every unjust Excommunication inflicted for opposing of Doctrine, must necessarily suppose the Doctrine opposed to be infallibly true, and absolutely exempt from Error; otherwise the Sentence it self would be unreasonable and unjust, as wanting sufficient ground.* From whence you charge Protestants with greater Tyranny and Injustice towards their People, than they can with any colour or pretence of Reason, charge upon the Roman Church, which Excommunicates no Man, but for denying such Doctrine as is both infallibly true, and also Fundamental, at least as to its formal Object. This is the strength of all you say, which will be reduced to this short Question, *Whether the proceedings of that Church be more unreasonable, which excommunicates such as openly oppose her Doctrine, supposing her Fallible; or of that Church, which excommunicates all who will*

will not believe whatever she defines to be *Infallibly true*. This is the true State of the *Controversie*, which must be judged by the resolving another Question; Whether it be not a more unreasonable *Usurpation*, to bind Men upon pain of *Damnation* hereafter, and Excommunication here, to believe every thing *Infallible* which a *Church* defines, or to bind Men to Peace to a *Churches Determinations*, reserving to Men the liberty of their judgments, on pain of Excommunication, if they violate that Peace. For it is plain on the one side, where a *Church* pretends *Infallibility*, the Excommunication is directed against the Persons for refusing to give *Internal Assent* to what she defines: But, where a *Church* doth not pretend to that, the Excommunication respects wholly that *Overt Act*, whereby the *Churches Peace* is broken. And if a *Church* be bound to look to her own Peace, no doubt she hath power to *Excommunicate* such as openly violate the Bonds of it; which is only an Act of Caution in a *Church*, to preserve her self in *Unity*; but where it is given out, that the *Church* is *Infallible*, the Excommunication must be so much the more unreasonable, because it is against those *Internal Acts* of the Mind, over which the *Church*, as such, hath no direct Power. And thus, I hope, you see how much more just and reasonable the Proceedings of our *Church* are than of yours; and that, *eo nomine*, because she pretends to be infallible, and ours doth not.

His Lordship shews further in *Vindication* of the *Church of England*, and her grounds of Faith, that the *Church of England* grounded her *Positive Articles* upon *Scripture*; and her *Negative* do refute there, where the thing affirmed by them, is not affirmed by *Scripture*, nor directly to be concluded out of it. And this (he saith) is the main Principle of all Protestants, that *Scripture* is sufficient to *Salvation*, and contains in it all things necessary to it. The *Fathers* are plain, the *Schoolmen* not strangers in it. And *Stapleton* himself confesses as much. Nay, and you dare not deny it, as to all material Objects of Faith, and your formal here signifies nothing. And when A. C. saith, That the *Church of England* grounded her *Positive Articles* upon *Scripture*, if themselves may be Judges in their own cause. His Lordship answers, P. 53. n. 21. We are contented to be judged by the joynt and constant belief of the *Fathers*, which lived within the first four or five hundred Years after *Christ*, when the *Church* was at the best, and by the *Councils* held within those times, and to submit to them in all those Points of *Doctrine*. This Offer you grant to be very fair, and you do, for your selves, promise the same, and say, You will make it good upon all Occasions. Which we shall have tryal of before the end of this Book. To what his Lordship saith, concerning the *Negative Articles*, That they refute where the thing affirmed by them is either not affirmed in *Scripture*, or not directly to be concluded out of it. A. C. replies, That the *Baptism* of *Infants* is not expressly (at least not evidently) affirmed in *Scripture*, nor directly (at least not demonstratively) concluded out of it. Here two things his Lordship answers. 1. To the Expression. 2. To the Thing.

1. To the Expression; That he is no way satisfied with A. C. his Addition, P. 54. n. 1: (not expressly, at least not evidently :) for (saith he) What means he? If he speak of the Letter of *Scripture*, then whatsoever is expressly, is evidently in the *Scripture*, and so his Addition is in vain. If he speak of the meaning of *Scripture*, then his Addition is cunning. For many things are expressly in *Scripture*, which yet in their meaning are not evidently there. And as little satisfied his Lordship declares himself, with that other (not directly, at least not demonstratively) because many things are directly concluded, which are not demonstratively. To the first you answer, That a Point may be expressed, yet not evidently expressed; otherwise there could be no doubt concerning what

what were exprest in Scripture, since Man never question things that are evident. Now, say you, the Baptism of Infants must not only be exprest, but evidently exprest, to prove it sufficiently, i. e. undeniably, by Scripture alone. But the Question being concerning Matters of Doctrine, and not meer words, those things are expressly affirmed, which are evidently, and no other: For it is one thing for words to be expressly in Scripture, and another for Doctrines to be so. For these latter are no further expressly affirmed there, than as there is evidence, that the meaning of such words doth contain such a Doctrine in them. As to take your own Instance, *This is my Body*, we grant the words to be express; but we deny, that which he had then in his hands was his real Body; (for his Hands were part of his real Body.) Now, we do not say, That the Doctrine of Transubstantiation is expressly, but not evidently contained here; for, we say, The Doctrine is not there at all, but only that those are the express words; *This is my Body*; as it is in other figurative Expressions in Scripture. But that which causeth this litigation about words, is, That you look upon that which is evident and undeniable to be all one, whereas there may be sufficient evidence, where all Men are not perswaded by it. And so you would put his Lordship to prove out of Scripture, Infant-Baptism evidently and demonstratively, i. e. undeniably; whereas his Lordship supposeth it enough for his purpose, to prove it by such sufficient Evidence, as may convince any reasonable Man. And this was all his Lordship meant, when he said, *That our Negative Articles do refute, where the thing is not affirmed in Scripture, or not directly concluded out of it.* And, if you will stand to the strict sense of these words, you will be forced to prove all those Doctrines of your Church, which ours denies to be true, so evidently and demonstratively, i. e. undeniably, as you would put him upon for the proof of Infant-Baptism.

- §. 8. To leave therefore this Verbal Dispute, and come to the thing: His Lordship saith, *That it may be concluded directly out of Scripture, That Infants ought to be Baptized, &c.* For which, he insists on two places of Scripture, John 3. 8. *Except a Man be born again of Water, and of the Spirit, &c.* which being interpreted according to the sense of the Fathers, and the ancient Church, and as your own Party acknowledge it ought to be interpreted, do evidently assert Infant-Baptism. By which, your Exception of a Pelagian Anabaptist, who denies Original Sin, and from thence saith, *That Infants cannot be born again, is taken away*; for the same Tradition of the Ancient Church, which from hence infers the Baptism of Infants, doth it upon that ground, *because they are guilty of Original Sin*, as you might have seen by his Lordship's Citations to that purpose. The other place he insists on, is, Act. 2. 38, 39. which, by the acknowledgement of Ferus and Salmeron, holds for Infant-Baptism. But, when you say, *That you would not weaken the Argument from John 3. for Infant-Baptism; because you only would shew, that it cannot be proved demonstratively from Scripture alone, against a perverse Heretick*; You seem not much to consider what those perverse Hereticks (as you call them) hold as to Infant-Baptism, which is, not meerly that Infant-Baptism is not commanded in Scripture, but that it is a thing unlawful, as being a perverting of the Institution of Christ, as to the subject of Baptism. For the main Question between us and the Antipedobaptists, is not, concerning an absolute and express Command for Baptizing Infants; but whether our Blessed Saviour hath not by a positive Precept so determined the Subject of Baptism, viz. adult Persons professing the Faith, that the alteration of the Subject, viz. in Baptizing Infants, be not a deviation from, and perversion of the Institution of Christ in a substantial part of it; or
- in

in short thus, whether our *Saviour* hath so determined the subject of Baptism, as to exclude *Infants*. And although, the question being thus stated, the proof ought to lie on those who affirm it, yet taking in only the help of *Scripture* and reason, it were no difficult matter to prove directly and evidently, that *Infants* are so far from being excluded *Baptism* by the *Institution* of *Christ*, that there are as many grounds as are necessary to a matter of that nature, to prove that the Baptizing them is suitable to the *Institution* of *Christ*, and agreeable to the *state* of the *Church* under the *Gospel*. For, If there were any ground to exclude them, it must be either the *incapacity* of the *subject*, or some express precept and *Institution* of our *Saviour*. But neither of these can be supposed to do it.

1. Not incapacity as to the ends of *Baptism*: for clearing which, these two things must be premised: 1. *That the rule and measure, as to the use and capacity of Divine Institutions, is to be fetched from the end of them.* For, this was the ground of the Circumcision of the *Proselytes* under the *Law*: and this was the way the *Apostles* did interpret *Christ's Commission* for Baptizing all Nations, as to the capacity of the subjects of it, *Act. 10. 47.* *Can any man forbid water, that these should not be Baptized, which have received the Holy Ghost, as well as we:* where the question was concerning the *subject* of *Baptism*. For it might be made evident, that the *Apostles* at first did interpret their Commission of *Baptizing all Nations*, only of the *Jews* of all Nations: for after that, *S. Peter* looked on the *Gentiles* as *unclean*: and the *Disciples* at *Jerusalem* charged *S. Peter* with it, as a great fault, for going in to men *uncircumcised*, *Acts 11. 3.* Therefore we see when the question was concerning the *subject* of *Baptism*; the only Argument is drawn from the *design* and *ends* of it; that they who were capable of the thing signified ought not to be denied the use of the sign. And thus by a parity of reason built on equal grounds, those who are capable of the great things represented in *Baptism* and confirmed by it, *viz. God's pardoning grace, and acceptance to eternal life,* ought not to be denied the external sign, which is *Baptism* it self. And therefore, 2. *Where there is a capacity as to the main ends of an Institution, an incapacity as to some ends doth not exclude from it.* As is most evident in the *Baptism* of our *Blessed Saviour*, in whom there was a greater incapacity as to the main ends of *Baptism*, than possibly can be in *Infants*; for his *Baptism* could not at all be for the *remission of sins*. Now we see, although there were but one end, and that a very general one mentioned, *That he might fulfil all righteousness*, *Matth. 3. 15.* yet we see, that was sufficient to persuade *John* to Baptize him. Whereby we see evidently in this practice of our *Saviour* built on a general and common ground, that a capacity as to one end of a positive *Institution*, is sufficient to make such a practice lawful, and in some cases a duty. § 9.

These two general *Principles* being laid down; it were easie to shew, 1. That what incapacity there is in *Infants*, is not destructive of the main ends of *Baptism*; which is chiefly thought to be the incapacity of understanding the nature or ends of the *Institution*; and if that exclude, it must either be, that it is a thing repugnant to reason, that any Divine *Institution* should be applied to persons incapable of understanding the nature and ends of it, which would highly reflect on the wisdom of *God* in appointing Circumcision for Children eight days old, who were certainly as incapable of understanding the ends of that, as our *Children* are of *Baptism*; or else, that there is some peculiarity in the *Institution* of *Baptism*, which must exclude them from it under the *Gospel*: which that there is not, will appear presently.

2. That

2. That *there is a capacity in Infants as to the main ends of Baptism*, which have either an aspect from God to us, in regard of its *Institution*, or from us to God, in regard of our *undertaking* it. Now the chief ends of a Divine Institution as such, are *such as respect Gods Intention* in it towards us, in which respect it is properly a *sign*; but as it respects God from us, it is properly a *Ceremony* betokening our profession and restipulation towards God. Now the ends of it as a *sign*, are to represent and exhibit to us the nature of the *grace of the Gospel* as it cleanseth and purifieth, and to confirm the truth of the *Covenant on Gods part*, and to enstate the partakers of it in the privileges of the *Church of God*; now as to all these ends, there is no incapacity in *Infants* to exclude them from Baptism, because of them. So that nothing can seem wanting of the *ends of Baptism*, but that which seems most *Ceremonial* in it, which is the personal *restipulation*, which yet may reasonably be supplied by *Sponsors*, so far as to make it of the nature of a solemn *Contract and Covenant* in sight of the Congregation. Thus far it appears from *Scripture and Reason*, that no incapacity in *Infants* doth exclude them from Baptism.

2. That there is no direct or consequential prohibition made by our *Blessed Saviour* to exclude them. For granting that he had the power to limit and determine the subject of *Baptism*, the question is, Whether he hath so far done it as to exclude *Infants*? And nothing of that nature is pretended, before the last Commission given to the *Apostles*, of *Teaching and Baptizing all Nations*, Matth. 28. 19. And that by this expression there is no exclusion of *Infants* will appear; 1. If our *Saviour* had intended the gathering of *Churches* among the *Gentiles* according to the *Law of Moses*, he could hardly have expressed it after another manner than thus, *Go Profelyte all Nations, Circumcising them*. Now I appeal to any mans judgment and reason, whether in such words it could be imagined, that the *Infants* of such *Gentile-Profelytes* should be excluded Circumcision; and what reason can there be then from these words to imagine, that our *Saviour* did intend to exclude the *Infants of Gentile-Converts* from Baptism? 2. We must consider, what apprehensions those whom our *Saviour* directed these words to, *viz.* the *Apostles*, had concerning the *Church-state* of such as were in an external Covenant with God, which they measured by the general reason of that *Covenant* which God made with the *Jews*; Can we then think, that when our *Saviour* bid the *Apostles* gather whole Nations into *Churches*, they should imagine the *Infants* were excluded out of it, when they were so solemnly admitted into it, in that dispensation which was in use among them? 3. The *Gentiles* being now to be first *Profelyted to Christianity*, the order of the words was necessary: for who ever imagined, but that such as were wholly strangers to *Christianity*, as those were whom *Christ* there speaks of, were to be *first taught*, or *discipled*, before they were to be Baptized? For suppose, it should be said to such persons among whom *Infant Baptism* is the most used, *Go and Disciple the Indians, Baptizing them*, &c. could any one conceive the intention of such a Commission was to exclude the *Infants* of all those *Indians* from Baptism, when it was well known that *Infant-Baptism* was used among those who came with that Commission? And therefore neither these words here, nor those Mark 16. 16. *He that believeth and is Baptized*, &c. can in reason be so interpreted as to exclude *Infants*, when the meer order of nature, and necessity of the thing, requires that those who first own *Christianity* by being Baptized, ought, before such Baptism, not only to believe, but to make profession of that Faith; but this reacheth not at all to the case of such *Infants*

fants as are born of those persons. For if any one had said to *Abraham*, *He that believes, and is circumcised, shall be saved*, Could it have been so interpreted, that the intention was to exclude his *Children* from *Circumcision*? No more ought these words of our *Saviour* be strained to a greater prejudice of the right of *Infants* to Baptism, than those other to their right of *Circumcision*. And thus far we see there is no ground from *Scriptures*, or *Reason*, why *Infants* should be excluded.

And, were it not too large a Digression, I might further shew how suitable the Baptism of *Infants* is to the administration of *things* under the Gospel; but I shall only propound some considerations concerning it. §. 10.

1. That if it had been *Christ's intention* to exclude *Infants*, there had been far greater reason for an express prohibition; than of an express command, if his intention were to admit them: because this was suitable to the general grounds of *God's dispensation* among them before. 2. It is very hard to conceive that the *Apostles* thought *Infants* excluded by *Christ*, when after *Christ's Assent* they looked on themselves as bound to observe the *Jewish Customs*, even when they had Baptized many thousand People. 3. If admission of *Infants* to Baptism were a meer Relique of Judaism, it seems strange that none of the *Judaizing Christians* should be charged with it, who yet are charged with the observation of other *Judaical* rites. 4. Since the *Jewish Christians* were so much offended at the neglect of *Circumcision*, *Acts* 21. 21. Can we in reason think they should quietly bear their *Children* being wholly thrown out of the Church; as they would have been, if neither admitted to *Circumcision* nor Baptism? 5. Had it been contrary to *Christ's Institution*, we should not have had such evidence of its early practice in the Church as we have. And here I acknowledge the use of *Apostolical Tradition* to manifest this to us; In which sense I acknowledge what *St. Austin* saith, *That the custom of our mother the Church is not to be contemned or thought superfluous, neither is it to be believed but as an Apostolical Tradition*. For that the words are to be read so, (and not, as you translate them, *nor at all to be believed unless it had been an Apostolical Tradition*, from thence inferring, that *Infant-Baptism* were not to be believed at all, but for Tradition) appears by three ancient Manuscripts at Oxford, as well as the course of the sentence, and *St. Austin's* judgment in other places, viz. that it ought to be read, *Nec omnino credenda nisi Apostolica traditio esse*, and not *esse*. But we grant that the practice of the Church from *Apostolical times* is a great confirmation that it was never *Christ's intention* to have *Infants* excluded from Baptism. And thus much may suffice to shew, what evidence we have from *Scripture* and *Reason*, without recourse wholly to *Tradition*, or building upon any more controverted places, to justify the Churches practice in *Infant-Baptism*, which is as much as is necessary for us to do. What follows concerning the founding *Divine Faith on Apostolical Tradition*, will be fully considered in the succeeding Controversie concerning the resolution of Faith, to which we now hasten.

6.

CHAP.

P

C H A P. V.

The Romanists way of Resolving Faith.

112:2:6

The ill consequences of the resolution of Faith by the Churches Infallibility. The grand Absurdities of it. manifested by its great unreasonableness in many particulars. The certain Foundations of Faith unsettled by it, as is largely proved. The Circle unavoidable by their new attempt. The impossibility of proving the Church Infallible by the way that Moses, Christ, and his Apostles were proved to be so. Of the Motives of Credibility, and how far they belong to the Church. The difference between Science and Faith consider'd, and the new art of Mens believing with their wills. The Churches testimony must be, according to their principles, the formal object of Faith. Of their esteem of Fathers, Scripture and Councils. The rare distinctions concerning the Churches infallibility discussed. How the Church can be Infallible by the assistance of the Holy Ghost, yet not divinely Infallible, but in a manner and after a sort. T. C. applauded for his excellent faculty in contradicting himself.

§. 1.

HE that hath a mind to betray an excellent Cause, may more advantageously do it; by bringing weak and insufficient Evidences for it, than by the greatest heat and vigour of Opposition against it. For there cannot possibly be any greater prejudice done to a weighty and important truth, than to persuade Men to believe it on such grounds, which are, if not absolutely false, yet much more disputable than the thing it self. For hereby the minds of Men are taken off from the native evidence, which the truth enquired after offers to them, and build their assent upon the certainty of the *mediums* suggested as the only grounds to establish a firm assent upon. By which means, when upon severe enquiry, the falsity and insufficiency of those grounds is discovered, the person so discovering lies under a dangerous temptation of calling into question the truth of that, which he finds he assented to upon grounds apparently weak and insufficient. And the more refined and subtle the *speculations* are, the more sublime and mysterious the matters believed; the greater still the danger of *Scepticism* is, upon a discovery of the unsoundness of those principles which such things were believed upon. Especially, if the more confident and Magisterial party of those who profess the belief of such things, do with the greatest heat decry all other ways as uncertain, and obtrude these principles upon the world, as the only sure foundation for the belief of them. It was anciently a great question among the *Philosophers*, whether there were any certainty in the principles of knowledge; or, supposing certainty in things, whether there were any undoubted *axioms*, or rules to obtain this certainty of knowledge by: If then any one *Señ* of *Philosophers* should have undertaken to prove the certainty that was in knowledge upon this account, because whatever their *Señ* or Party delivered was infallibly true; they had not only shamefully beg'd the thing in dispute, but made it much more liable to question than before. Because every error discovered in that *Señ*, would not only prove the fondness and arrogance of their pretence of being *Infallible*; but would, to all such as believed the certainty of things on the authority of their *Señ*, be an argument to disprove all certainty of knowledge, when they once discovered the errors of those whose authority they relied upon. Just such is the case of the

Church

Church of Rome in this present Controversie concerning the Resolution of Faith. The question is, *What the certain Grounds of our Assent are to the Principles and Rule of Christian Religion?* The Romanists pretend, that there can be no ground of *True and Divine Faith* at all, but the Infallible Testimony of their Church; let then any rational Man judge, whether this be not the most compendious way to overthrow the Belief of Christianity in the World? For our assent must be wholly suspended upon that supposed Infallibility, which when once it falls (as it unavoidably doth upon the discovery of the least Error in the Doctrine of that Church) what becomes then of the Belief of Christianity which was built upon that, as its only sure Foundation? So that it is hardly imaginable, there could be any design more really destructive to Christianity, or that hath a greater tendency to Atheism, than the modern pretence of Infallibility, and the Jesuits way of resolving Faith.

Which was the reason why his Lordship was so unwilling to engage in that Controversie, *How we know the Scriptures to be the Word of God*: Not out of any distrust he had of solving it upon Protestant Principles, as you vainly suggest; nor out of any fears of being left himself in that Labyrinth, which, after all your Endeavours you have lost your self and your Cause in; as appears by your attempting this way, and that way to get out, and at last standing in the very middle of that Circle you thought your self out of. If his Lordship thought this more a question of curiosity than necessity, it was because out of his great Charity he supposed them to be Christians he had to deal with. But if his Charity were therein deceived, you shall see how able we are to make good the Grounds of our Religion against all Adversaries, whether Papists or others. And so far is the answering of this Question from making the weakness of our Cause appear, that I doubt not but to make it evident that our Cause stands upon the same Grounds which our common Christianity doth; and that we are Protestants by the same reason that we are Christians. And on the other side, that you are so far from giving any true Grounds of Christian Faith, that nothing will more advance the highest Scepticism and Irreligion, than such Principles as you insist on for resolving Faith. The true reason then, why the Archbishop declared any unwillingness to enter upon this Dispute, was not the least apprehension how insuperably hard the resolution of this Question was (as you pretend) but because of the great mischief your Party had done, in starting such Questions, you could not resolve with any satisfaction to the common Reason of Mankind; and that you run your selves into such a Circle in which you conjure up more Spirits than you are ever able to lay, by giving those Advantages to Infidelity, which all your Sophistry can never answer on those Principles you go upon. That this was the true Ground of his Lordship's seeming Averseness from this Controversie, appears by his plain words, where he tells you at first, *of the danger of Men's being disputed into Infidelity by the Circle between Scripture and Tradition*, and by his expressing his Sense of the great Harm you have done by the starting of that Question among Christians, *How we know the Scriptures to be the Word of God*. But although in this respect he might be said to be drawn into it, yet lest you should think his Averseness argued any Consciousness of his own Inability to answer it, you may see how closely he follows it; with what Care and Accuracy he handles it, with what strength of Reason and Evidence he hath discovered the weakness of your way, which he hath done with that success, that he hath put you to miserable shifts to avoid the force of his Arguments, as will appear afterwards. I am therefore

fore fully of his mind, that it is a matter of such consequence it deserves to be sifted, were it for no other end, but to lay open the Jaglings and Impostures of your way of resolving Faith.

S. 3.
Ibid.

Which we now come more closely to the discovery of; for, as you tell us, The Bishop propounding diverse ways of resolving the Question, first falls to the attacking your way, who prove it by Tradition and Authority of the Church. And his first Onset is so successful, that it makes you visibly recoil, and withdraw your self into so untenable a Shelter as exposeth you to all the Attempts which any Adversary would desire to make upon you. For, whereas you are charged by his Lordship with running into the most absurd kind of Argumentation, viz. by proving the Scriptures Infallible by Tradition, and that Tradition Infallible by Scripture; you think to escape that Circle, by telling us, That you prove not the Churches Infallibility by the Scripture, but by the Motives of Credibility belonging to the Church. This then being your main Principle which your following Discourse is built upon, and in your judgment the only probable way to avoid the Circle, that you may not think I am afraid of encountering you in your greatest Strength, I dare put the Issue of the Cause upon this Promise, that (besides the weak Proofs you bring for the thing it self, which shall after be considered) if this way of yours be not chargeable with all the Absurdities such an Attempt is capable of, I will be content to acknowledge what you say to be true, which is, That your way of resolving Faith hath no difficulty at all, and that ours is insuperably hard, which I think are as hard terms as can be imposed upon me. Now there are two grand Absurdities, which any vindication of an Opinion is subject to; first, If it be manifestly unreasonable; and, 2. If supposing it true, it doth not effect what it was intended for. Now these two I undertake to make good against this way of your resolving Faith, that it is guilty of the highest Unreasonableness; and that, supposing it true, you are in a Circle as much as before.

1. First, I begin with the unreasonableness of it, which is so great, that I know not, whether I may abstain from calling it Ridiculous; but, that I may not seem to follow you, in asserting confidently, and proving weakly, it will be necessary throughly to examine the Grounds on which your Opinion stands, and then raise our Batteries against it. Three grand Principles your Discourse relies upon, which are your Postulata in order to the resolving Faith.

1. That it is necessary to the believing the Scriptures to be the Word of God with a Divine Faith, that it be built on the infallible Testimony of the Church.

2. That your Church is that Catholick Church whose Testimony is Infallible.

3. That this Infallibility is to be known and assented to upon the Motives of Credibility. These three, I suppose, if your confused Discourse were reduced to Method, would be freely acknowledged by your self to be the Principles on which your Resolution of Faith depends. And although I am sufficiently assured of the Falseness of your two first Principles (as will appear in the Sequel of this Discourse) yet that which I have now particularly undertaken, is, the unreasonableness of resolving Faith upon these Principles taken together, viz. That the Infallible Testimony of your Church, is the only Foundation for Divine Faith; and that this Infallibility can be known only by the Motives of Credibility. It then in this way of resolving Faith, you require Assent beyond all proportion of evidence, if you run into the same Absurdities you would seem to avoid, if you leave Men more un-

certain

certain in their Religion than you found them; you cannot certainly excuse this way from unreasonableness. And each of these I undertake to make good against this way of yours, whereby you would assure Men of the Truth and Divinity of the Scriptures.

I. An Assent is hereby required beyond all proportion or degree of Evidence; §. 4. for you require an *Infallible Assent*, only upon *probable Grounds*; which is as much as requiring *Infallibility* in the conclusion, where the Premises are only *probable*. Now that you require an *Assent Infallible* to the nature of Faith, appears by the whole Series of your Discourse: For, to this very end you require *Infallibility* in the *Testimony* of your Church, because otherwise, you say *Our Faith would be uncertain*; it is plain then, you require an *Infallible Assent* in Faith; and, it is as plain, that this *Assent*, according to you, can be built only upon *probable Grounds*, for you acknowledge the *Motives of Credibility*, to be no more than such; yet those are all the Grounds you give why the Church should be believed *Infallible*. If you say, *That which makes the Assent Infallible, is, that Infallibility which is in the Churches Testimony*; I reply, That this is a most unreasonable thing, to go about to establish an *Infallible Assent*, meerly because the *Testimony* is supposed to be in it self *Infallible*: For, *Assent* is not according to the *Objective Certitude* of things, but the *evidence* of them to our *Understandings*. For is it possible to assent to the truth of a Demonstration in a demonstrative manner, because any *Mathematician* tells one, The thing is demonstrable? For in that case the *Assent* is not according to the *Evidence* of the thing, but according to the opinion such a Person hath of him, who tells him, It is demonstrable. Nay, supposing that Person *infallible* in saying so, yet if the other hath no means to be *infallibly assured*, that he is so, such a one's *Assent* is as *doubtful*, as if he were not *infallible*: Therefore, supposing the *Testimony* of your Church to be really *infallible*, yet since the means of believing it are but *probable* and *prudential*, the *Assent* cannot be according to the nature of the *Testimony*, considered in it self, but according to the *Reasons* which induce me to believe such a *Testimony* *infallible*. And in all such cases, where I believe one thing for the sake of another, my *Assent* to the *Object* believed, is according to my *Assent* to the *Medium* on which I believe it; for by the means of that, the other is conveyed to our Minds. As our Sight is not according to the Light in the Body of the Sun, but that which presseth upon our Organs of Sense: So that, supposing your Churches *Testimony* to be in it self *infallible*, if one may be deceived in judging whether your Church be *infallible* or no, one may be deceived in such things which he believes upon that supposed *Infallibility*. It being an impossibility, that the *Assent* to the *Matters of Faith*, should rise higher, or stand firmer, than the *Assent* to the *Testimony* is, upon which those things are believed. Now, that one may be deceived according to your own Principles, in judging whether the Church be *Infallible*, appears by this, That you have no other means to prove the *Infallibility* of your Church, but only *probable* and *prudential Motives*. For, I desire to know, whether an *Infallible Assent* to the *Infallibility* of your Church, can be grounded on those *Motives of Credibility*? If you affirm it, then there can be no imaginable necessity to make the *Testimony* of your Church *Infallible*, in order to *Divine Faith*; for you will not, I hope, deny, but that there are at least equal *Motives of Credibility*, to prove the *Divine Authority* of the *Scriptures*, as the *Infallibility* of your Church; and, if so, why may not an *Infallible Assent* be given to the *Scriptures* upon those *Motives of Credibility*, as well as to your Churches *Infallibility*? If you deny the *Assent* built upon the *Motives of Credibility* to

to be *Infallible*; how can you make the Assent to your Churches Testimony to be *Infallible*, when that *Infallibility* is attempted to be proved only by the *Motives of Credibility*? And therefore it necessarily follows; That notwithstanding your bearing it so high under the pretence of *Infallibility*, you leave Men's Minds much more wavering in their Assent than before; in that, as shall afterwards appear, these very *Motives of Credibility* do not at all prove the *Infallibility* of your Church, which undoubtedly prove the *Truth and Certainty* of *Christian Religion*. Thus, while by this Device, you seek to avoid the Circle, you destroy the Foundation of your Discourse, *That there must be an Infallible Assent to the Truth of that Proposition, That the Scriptures are the Word of God* (which you call *Divine Faith*) which, how can it be *Infallible*, when that *Infallibility*, at the highest, by your own confession, is but *evidently credible*, and so, I suppose the *Authority* of the *Scriptures* is, without your Churches *Infallibility*.

§. 5. And thus you run into the same Absurdities which you would seem to avoid, which is the second thing, to manifest the unreasonableness of this way; for whatever *Absurdity* you charge us with, for believing the *Doctrine of Christ* upon the *Motives of Credibility*, unavoidably falls upon your selves for believing the Churches *Infallibility* on the same Grounds: For if we leave the *Foundation of Faith uncertain*, you do so too; if we build a *Divine Faith* upon the *Motives of Credibility*, so do you; if we make every one's Reason the Judge in the choice of his Religion, so must you be forced to do, if you understand the Consequence of your own Principles.

1. It is impossible for you to give a better account of Faith by the *Infallibility* of your Church, than we can do without it; For, if *Divine Faith* cannot be built upon the *Motives* proving the *Doctrine of Christ*, what Sense or Reason is there, that it should be built on those *Motives* which prove your Churches *Infallibility*? So that, if we leave the *Foundation of Faith uncertain*, you much more; and that I prove by a Rule of much Authority with you, by which you use to pervert the weak judgments of such, who in your case do not discern the *Sophistry* of it: Which is when you come to deal with Persons, whom you hope to *Profelyte*, you urge them with this great Principle, *That Prudence is to be our Guide in the choice of our Religion, and that Prudence directs us to chuse the safest way, and that it is much safer to make choice of that way, which both sides agree Salvation is to be obtained in, than of that which the other side utterly denies Men can be saved in.* How far this Rule will hold in the choice of Religion, will be examined afterwards: But if we take your word, that it is a sure Rule; I know nothing will be more certainly advantageous to us, in our present case. For both sides, I hope, are agreed, that there are *sufficient Motives of Credibility*, as to the belief of the *Scriptures*; but we utterly deny that there are any such *Motives* as to the *Infallibility* of your Church; it then certainly follows, *That our way is the more eligible and certain, and that we lay a surer Foundation for Faith, than you do upon your Principles for resolving Faith.*

2. Either you must deny any such thing as that you call *Divine Faith*; or you must assert, that it may have no other *Foundation* than the *Motives of Credibility*, which yet is that, you would seem most to avoid by introducing the *Infallibility* of your Church, *that the Foundation of Faith may not be uncertain*; whereas, supposing what you desire, you must of necessity do what you would seem most fearful of, which is making a *Divine Faith* to rest upon *prudential Motives*. Which I thus prove: It is an undoubted *Axiom* among the great men of your side, *That whatever is a Foundation for a Divine Faith, must it self be believed with a firm, certain, and infallible Assent*:

Assent: Now, according to your principles, the *Infallibility* of the Church is the Foundation for Divine Faith; and therefore that must be believed with an *Assent infallible*. It is apparent then, an *Assent infallible* is required, which is that which in other terms you call *Divine Faith*; now when you make it your business to prove the *Churches Infallibility* upon your *prudential Motives*, I suppose your design is by those proofs, to induce Men to believe it; and if Men then do believe it upon those *Motives*, do you not found an *Assent Infallible*, or a *Divine Faith*, upon the *Motives of Credibility*? And by the same reason that you urge against us the necessity of believing the *Scriptures to be the word of God by Divine Faith*; because it is the ground why we believe the things contained in the *Scripture*, we press on your side the necessity of believing the *Infallibility of the Church by a Faith equally Divine*, because that it is to you the only sufficient Foundation of believing the *Scriptures*, or any thing contained in them.

3. You make by this way of resolving Faith, every Mans reason the only Judge in the choice of his Religion: which you are pleased to charge on us as a great Absurdity: yet, you who have deserved so very ill of Reason, are fain to call in her best assistance in a case of the greatest moment, viz. On what ground we must believe the *Scriptures to be the word of God*. You, say, Because the Church is infallible, which delivers them to us? but how should we come to know that she is infallible? you tell us, By the *Motives of Credibility*; very good: But must not every ones reason judge whether these *Motives* be credible or no? and whether they belong peculiarly to your Church, so as to prove the *Infallibility* of it, as it is distinct from all other societies of Christians in the world? You tell us indeed, That these *Motives* make it evidently credible; but must we believe it to be so, because you say so? If so; then the ground of believing is not the *Credibility* of the *Motives*, but of your *Testimony*, and therefore you ought to make it evidently true, that whatever you speak is undoubtedly true, which whosoever reads your Book, will hardly be perswaded to. So that of necessity every Mans reason must be Judge, whether your Church be infallible or no; and thus at last you give Reason the *Umpirage* in the choice of Religion. And what is there more than this that we contend for? If there be then any danger of *Scepticism*, a private spirit, or what other inconveniencies you object against our way of judging the truth of Religion by the Use of Reason, it will fall much more heavily upon our selves, in this way of believing the *Infallibility of the Church on the Motives of Credibility*. Therefore I assure you, it were much more consonant to the principles of your party, to tell Men, The *Infallibility of your Church ought to be taken for granted, and that Men are damned for not believing it, though no reason be given for it, but only because you say it* (which is as much as to say, the reason of the Point is, It must needs be so) than thus to expose it to the scorn and contempt of the world, by offering to prove it by your *Motives of Credibility*. For unawares you thereby give away the main of your Cause; for by the very offer of proving it, you make him whom you offer to prove it to, judge whether these proofs be sufficient or no? and if he be capable to judge of his Guide, certainly he may be of his Way too, considering that he hath, according to us, an *Infallible Rule* to judge of his Way; whereas, according to you, he hath but *Prudential Motives* in the choice of his Guide. Thus, by this Opinion of yours, you have gained thus much, That there is nothing so absurd, which you charge upon us, but it falls unavoidably upon your own head.

By this way of resolving Faith, you undermine it, and leave a sure Foundation for nothing but *Scepticism*; which is the last thing to shew the great

unreafo-

unreasonableness of this way of yours, that when you are making us believe you are taking the greatest care to make our Religion sure, you cancel our best evidences, and produce nothing but crack'd and broken titles, which will not stand any fair tryal at the bar of Reason. And that you make the Foundations of Religion uncertain, I offer to prove by the reason of the thing; for, if you require that as necessary for Faith, which was never believed to be so, when the Doctrine of Faith was revealed; if upon the pretence of *Infallibility* you assert such things, which destroy all the rational evidence of Christian Religion, and if at last you are far from giving the least satisfactory account concerning this *Infallibility of your Church*; then certainly we may justly charge you with *unsettling the Foundation of Religion*, instead of giving us a certain resolution of Faith.

1. You make that necessary to Faith, which was not looked on as such, when the Doctrine of the Gospel was revealed; and what other design can such a pretence seem to have, than to expose to contempt that Religion which was not received by a true Divine Faith, because it wanted that, which is now thought to be the only sure Foundation of Faith, viz. the *Infallibility of the Church of Rome*? What then will become of the Faith of all those who received Divine Revelations, without the *Infallible Testimony of any Church at all*? With what Faith did the Disciples of Christ at the time of his sufferings, believe the Divine Authority of the Old Testament? was it a true Divine Faith or not? If it was, whereon was it built? not certainly on the *Infallible Testimony of the Jewish Church*, which at that time consented to the death of the Messiah, condemning him as a malefactor and deceiver: Or did they believe it because of that great Rational Evidence they had to convince them, that those Prophecies came from God? If so, why may not we believe the Divinity of all the Scriptures on the same grounds, and with a Divine Faith too: With what Faith did those believe in the Messiah, who were not personally present at the Miracles which our Saviour wrought, but had them conveyed to them by such reports as the Woman of Samaria was to the Samaritans? Or were all such persons excused from believing, meerly because they were not Spectators? But by the same reason all those would be excused, who never saw our Saviour's miracles, or heard his Doctrine, or his Apostles: But if such persons then were bound to believe, I ask On what Testimony was their Faith founded? Was the Woman of Samaria infallible, in reporting the discourse between Christ and her? Were all the persons infallible, who gave an account to others of what Christ did; yet, I suppose, had it been your own case, you would have thought your self bound to have believed Christ to have been the Messiah, if you had lived at that time, and a certain account had been given you of our Saviour's Doctrine and Miracles by men faithful and honest, though you had no reason to have believed them *Infallible*: I pray, Sir, answer me, would you have thought your self bound to have believed, or no? If you affirm it (as I will suppose you so much a Christian as to say so) I pray then tell me, whether persons in those circumstances might not have a True and Divine Faith, where there was no *infallible Testimony*, but only Rational Evidence to build it self upon? And if those persons might have a Divine Faith upon such evidence as that was, may not we much more, who have evidence of the same nature indeed, but much more extensive, universal, and convincing than that was? And how then can you still assert an *infallible Testimony* of the conveyers of Divine Revelation, to be necessary to a Divine Faith? Nay further yet, How very few were there in comparison, in the first Ages of the Christian Church, who received the Doctrine of the Gospel from the mouths of persons infallible? And of those who

who did so, what certain evidence have men, That all those persons did receive the Doctrine upon the account of the *Infallibility* of the propounders, and not rather upon the *Rational Evidence* of the Truth of the Doctrine delivered, and whether the belief of their *Infallibility* was absolutely necessary to Faith, when the report of the *Evidences* of the Truth of the Doctrine might raise in them an obligation to believe, supposing them not *infallible* in that delivery of it; but that they looked on them as honest Men, who faithfully related, *What they had seen and heard*. And this seems the more probable, in that the *Apostles* themselves, in their undoubtedly divine writings, do so often appeal to their own *sufficiency* and *integrity*, without pleading so much their *Infallibility*. S. John saith, *That* ^{1 Joh. 1. 1.} *which we have seen and heard, and handled, declare we unto you.* S. Peter ^{2 Pet. 1. 16.} appeals to his being an *Eye-witness*, to make it appear he delivered *no cunningly devised fables*. S. Luke makes this a ground, *That the things were* ^{Luk. 1. 1.} *surely believed, because delivered from them who were Eye witnesses and Ministers of the Word*. If they insisted so much upon this *Rational Evidence*, and so sparingly on their own *Infallibility*; certainly they thought the one afforded a good foundation for Faith, though the other, after believing it, might highly advance it. And therefore I suggest not these things, in the least, to question the *Infallibility* of the *Apostles*, but to let us see, that even at that time, when there was a certain *infallible Testimony*, yet that is not urged as the only foundation for Faith, but *Rational Evidence* produced even by those persons who were thus infallible. If we descend lower in the *Christian Church*, or walk abroad to view the several *Plantations* of the *Churches* at that time, Where do we read or meet with the least intimation of an *infallible Testimony* of the *Catholick Church*; so call'd from its *Communion* with that of *Rome*? What *infallible Testimony* of that *Church* had the poor *Britains* to believe on? or those *Barbarians* mentioned in *Irenaeus*, who yet believed without a *written word*? What mention do we meet with, in all the ancient *Apologeticks* of *Christians*, wherein they give so large an account of the grounds of *Christian Faith*, of the modern method for *resolving Faith*? Nay, what one ancient *Father* or *Council* give the least countenance to this pretended *Infallibility*, much less make it the only sure *Foundation of Faith*, as you do? Nay, how very few are there among your selves who believe it, and yet think themselves never the worse *Christians* for it? If then your *Doctrine* be true, what becomes of the *Faith* of all these persons mentioned? Upon your principles their *Faith* could not be a *true and Divine Faith*; that is, *Let them all think they believed the Doctrine of Christ never so heartily, and obeyed it never so conscientiously; yet because they did not believe it on the Infallibility of your Church, their Faith was but a kind of gilded and splendid Infidelity, and none of them Christians, because not Jesuits*. And doth not this principle then fairly advance *Christianity* in the world, when the belief of it comes to be settled on Foundations never heard of in the best and purest times of it; nay, such Foundations, as for want of their believing them, their *Faith must be all in vain, and Christ dyed in vain for them*?

2. You assert such things upon the pretence of *Infallibility*, which destroy ^{s 7.} *all the rational evidence of Christian Religion*: And what greater dis-service could you possibly do to it, than by taking away all the proper grounds of certainty of it? And, instead of building it *super banc Petram*, upon the *Rock of Infallibility*, you do it only upon a *Quick-sand*, which swallows up the *Edifice*, and sucks in the *Foundations* of it. You would have men to believe the *Infallibility* of your *Church*, that their *Faith* might stand upon

Q

sure

sure grounds; and yet, if men believe this *Infallibility of your Church*, you require such things to be believed upon it, which destroy all kind of *certainty in Religion*. And that I prove by some of those principles which are received among you upon the account of the *Churches Infallibility*.

i. *That the judgment of Sense is not to be relied on, in matters of Faith*: This is the great Principle upon which the Doctrine of *Transubstantiation* stands in your Church; and this is all, the most considerative Men among you have to say, when all those *Contradictions* are offered to them, which that Doctrine is so big of, both to the judgment of sense and reason, *viz.* *That though it seem so contradictory; yet because the Church, which is infallible, delivers it, they are bound not to question it.* If this Principle then be true, That the judgment of sense is not to be relied on, in matters which sense is capable of judging of; it will be impossible for any one to give any satisfactory account of the grand *Foundations of Christian Faith*. For if we carefully examine the grounds of *Certainty in Christian Religion*, we find the great appeal made to the judgment of Sense, (*That which we have seen, and heard, and handled.*) If then the judgment of Sense must not be taken in a proper object, at due distance, and in such a thing wherein all Mens Senses are equally judges; I pray, tell me what assurance the Apostles could have, or any from them, of any miracles which Christ wrought, of any Doctrine which he preached; especially because in his miracles there was something above nature, in which case Men are more apt to suspect *Impositions*, than in things which are the continual Objects of Sense, as in the case of *Transubstantiation*? Wherein, if Men are not bound to rely on the judgment of Sense, you must say, that our Faculties are so made, that they may be imposed upon, in the proper Objects of them; and if so, farewell all *Certainty*, not only in Religion, but in all things else in the world. For what assurance can I have of the knowledge of any thing, if I find that my Faculties not only may be, but I am bound to believe that they actually are, deceived in a thing that is as proper an Object of Sense, as any in the world. And if a thing, which the judgment of all mankind (those excepted who have given away their sense and reason in this present case) doth unanimously concur in, may be false; What evidence can we have, when any thing is true? For, if a thing so plain and evident to our Senses may be false, *viz.* *That what I and all other Men see, is bread*, what ground of certainty can we have, but that which my Senses, and all other Mens judge to be false, may be true? for by this means you take away the *neither* both of Sense and Reason in things, and consequently, all things are equally true and false to us; and thence it follows, That Truth and Falshood are but Fancies, that our Faculties have no means to difference the one from the other, that in things we all agree in, as proper objects of Sense, we not only may be, but are deceived; and then farewell Sense, Reason and Religion together. For I pray, Tell me what Assurance could the Apostles have of the Resurrection of Christ's Individual Body from the grave, but the Judgment of Sense? What ways did he use to convince them, that he was not a Spectre or Apparition, but by an appeal to their Senses? by what means did he reclaim Thomas from his Infidelity, but by bidding him make use of his Senses? If Thomas had believed *Transubstantiation*, he would easily have answered our Saviours Argument, and told him, If there were not a productive, yet there might be an Adductive Transmutation of some other person into him: and the Disciples might all have said, It was true, there were the accidents of Christ's Body, the external shape and figure of it; but, for all they could discern, there might be some Invisible Spirit under those

external

external Accidents of Shape: And therefore they must desire to be excused from believing it to be his Body; for, *Hoc est corpus meum*, had told them already; *That the external Accidents might remain, where the Substance was changed*. Now therefore, when the Assurance of Christian Religion came from the judgment of the Senses of those who were *Eye-witnesses* of the *Miracles* and the *Resurrection of Christ*; if the Senses of Men may be so grossly deceived in the proper Objects of them in the case of *Transubstantiation*, what assurance could they themselves have, who were *Eye-witnesses* of them? And how much less assurance can we have, who have all our Evidence from the certainty of their Report? So that it appears upon the whole, that, take away the certainty of the *Judgment of Sense*, you destroy all *Certainty in Religion*; for, Tradition only conveys to us now, what was originally grounded upon the *Judgment of Sense*, and delivers to us in an undoubted manner, that which the *Apostles saw and heard*. And do not you then give a very good account of Religion by the *Infallibility* of your Church; when, if I believe your Church to be infallible, I must by virtue of that *Infallibility*, believe something to be true, which if it be true, there can be no certainty at all of the *Truth of Christian Religion*.

2. Another Principle is, *That we can have no certainty of any of the grounds of Faith, but from the Infallibility of your present Church*. Whereby you do these two things. 1. Destroy the *Obligation to Faith* which ariseth from the *rational Evidence of Christian Religion*. 2. Put the whole stress of the *Truth of Christianity* upon the proofs of your Churches *Infallibility*; by which things any one may easily see what tendency your Doctrine of *resolving Faith* hath, and how much it designs the overthrow of *Christianity*. 1. You destroy the *Obligation to Faith from the rational Evidence of Christian Religion*, by telling Men, as you do expressly in the very Title of your next Chapter, *That there can be no unquestionable Assurance of Apostolical Tradition, but from the infallible Authority of the present Church*. If so, then Men cannot have any unquestionable assurance that there was such a Person as *Christ* in the World, that he wrought such great *Miracles* for confirmation of his Doctrine, that he *died and rose again*; it seems we can have no assurance of these things if the *present Church* be not *Infallible*. And if we can have no assurance of them, what *Obligation* can lie upon us to believe them? for, assurance of the *matters of fact*, which are the *foundations of Faith*, is necessary in order to the obligation to believe; I mean such an assurance as matters of fact are capable of; for no higher can be required than the nature of things will bear. And what a strange assertion then is this, that *matters of Fact* cannot be conveyed to us in an unquestionable manner; unless the *present Church* stamp her *Infallibility* upon them? Cannot we have an unquestionable assurance that there were such Persons as *Cæsar* and *Pompey*, and that they did such and such things without some infallible Testimony? If we may in such things, why not in other *matters of fact* which infinitely more concern the World to know than whatever *Cæsar* or *Pompey* did? But this will be more at large examined afterwards; I only now take notice of the consequence of this Principle, and how fairly it destroys all *rational Evidence of the Truth of our Religion*; which whosoever takes away will be by force of Reason, a *Sceptick* in the first place, and an *Infidel* in the second. Neither is the danger merely in destroying the *rational Evidence of Religion*; but, 2. In putting the whole weight of Religion upon the proofs of the *present Churches Infallibility*, which whosoever considers how silly and weak they are, cannot sufficiently wonder at the design of those Men, who put the *most excellent Religion* in the World, and which is built upon the

the highest and truest Reason, to such a strange kind of Ordeal Tryal, that if she pass not through this St. Winifred's Needle, her Innocency must be suspected, and her Truth condemned. So that whosoever questions the truth of this kind of Purgation, will have a greater suspicion of a Juggle and Imposture if she be acquitted, than if she had never submitted to such a Tryal. And when we come to examine the Proofs brought for this Infallibility, it will then further appear, what uncertainty in Religion Men are betrayed to, under this confident Pretext of Infallibility. Thus we see what Scepticism in Religion the Principles owned upon the account of Infallibility, do bring Men to.

§. 9. 3. When you have brought Men to this, that the only sure Ground of Faith is the Infallibility of your Church, you are not able to give them any satisfactory account at all concerning it; but plunge them into greater uncertainties than ever they were in before. For you can neither satisfy them what that Church is which you suppose Infallible, what in that Church is the proper Subject of this Infallibility, what kind of Infallibility this is, or how we should know when the Church doth decide Infallibility, and when not; and yet every one of these Questions is no less than absolutely necessary to be resolved, in order to the Satisfaction of Men's Minds, as to the Foundation of their Faith.

1. You cannot satisfy Men what that Church is which you suppose to be Infallible. Certainly, if you had a design to give Men a certain Foundation for their Faith, you would not be so shy of discovering what it is you understand by that Church which you would have Infallible; if you had meant honestly, the first thing you should have done was to have prevented all mistakes concerning the meaning of the Church, when you know what various Significations it hath, not only in Scripture, but among your selves. Whether you mean the Church Essential, Representative, or Virtual, for every one of these upon occasion you make use of: And it was never more necessary to have explained them than in this place, and yet you with wonderful Care and Industry avoid any intimation of what you mean by that Church which you would prove Infallible. When you plead so earnestly for the Churches Infallibility, I pray tell us what you mean by the Church; do you intend the truly Catholick and Universal Church which comprehends in it all such as own and profess the Doctrine of Christ, in which sense it was well said by Abulensis. *Ecclesia universalis nunquam erat, quia nunquam tota errat, The universal Church never errs, because the whole Church is never deceived.* Or, do you mean by your Catholick Church some particular part of it, to which you apply the name of Catholick not for Universality of extent, but soundness of Doctrine? Then it will be necessary yet further, to shew what part of the Church that is, by what Right and Title that hath engrossed the name of Catholick, so as to exclude other Societies of Christians from it; and whether you must not first prove the absolute Integrity and Soundness of her Doctrine, before you can attribute this Title to it. For otherwise you will find that marvellously true, which the same Tostatus saith, *Ecclesia Latinorum non est Ecclesia Universalis sed quædam pars ejus: idèd etiamsi tota ipsa errasset, non errabat Ecclesia Universalis, quia manet Ecclesia Universalis in partibus illis quæ non errant, sive illæ sint numero plures quàm errantes, sive non.* So that if you prove the Infallibility of the Catholick Church, this proves nothing at all as to the Roman Church, which at most can be supposed to be but a part of it, and though that should err, the Catholick Church might not err, because that remains in those parts which err not, though they be more or less in number than those that err. This is the sense of his words; who

Præfat. in
Mat. quæst.
13.

Quæst. 4.
in Matth.
ad proleg. 2.

who seemed to have a much truer conception of the *Universal Church*, than those now of your *Señ and Party*. If then we may believe the *Church* to be *infallible*, and yet, in the mean time, condemn your *Church* for the grossest *Errors*: Will it not be found necessary for you, to tell us yet more distinctly, What you mean by the *Church* you would prove *Infallible*? But, supposing that only those parts you esteem *Catholick*, make up the *Catholick Church*, even among them the Question will still return, What you mean by this *Catholick Church*? Do you mean all the *Individual Persons* in this number, taken either *distributively* or *collectively*? Or, Do you mean, all those who are entrusted with the Government of these? And then, Whether all *Inferior Pastors*, or only *Bishops*? And if *Bishops*, Whether all those *collectively*, or else by way of *Representation in a Council*? And still remember to make it good, that what you pitch upon as the acception of the *Church*, be not an effect of humane Policy, as *Albertus Pighius* said. *All Councils were no more*; but that what you fasten the Acception of the *Church Catholick* upon, you be sure to make it out, that is the *Catholick Church* to whom the *Promises* are made in *Scripture*: And, be sure to tell us, How a *Church* comes to be *infallible* by *Representation*? Whether as they, who make the *Church representative*, deliver the Sense of the *Church* they represent; or by an immediate *Promise* made to them upon their Convention. If the former, Whether it will not be necessary, in order to the *Infallibility* of the *Council*, to know, that it speaks the sense of all those particular *Churches* whom they represent: If the latter, you must remember such *places* as belong to them, as representing the *Church*; for otherwise any company of *Christians* assembled together, will challenge an equal interest in them; and then you will find it a hard matter to prove one *Infallible*, and not the other. But, if after all this, your *Windmill* should dwindle into a *Nutcracker*, and this *Harrangue* concerning the *Infallibility* of the *Catholick Church*, should at last end in one particular *Person*; which by a strange *Catobressis*, must be call'd the *Church*, or else, as *Heir at Law* to her, doth take possession of all her Privileges. Then the *Testament* must be produced wherein he is named so, and those *Clauses* especially, wherein the Rights and Privileges of her are devolved over to him and his *Heirs for ever*. There being then so much ambiguity and uncertainty in the very name of the *Church Catholick*, which you would prove *infallible*, that if nothing else discovered your *Imposture*, yet this would sufficiently, that you would undertake to resolve *Men's Faith* by the *Infallibility* of the *Church*, and yet never offer to shew what that *Church* is.

2. Supposing you had shewn what the *Church* is, yet you never tell us what the *Subject of Infallibility* is in that *Church*. For, when in this case you speak of *Infallibility*, you must remember you are not to shew what that *Church* is, which is not deceived in judging concerning things necessary to Salvation, but what the *Church* is, which is *infallible* in her *Direction* of others to Salvation: For, you speak of such an *Infallibility* as must be a *Guide* to others, and whose *infallible judgment* must be known to all such who must resolve their *Faith* into her *Testimony*: You would have done then no more than was absolutely necessary to have precisely shewn us where this *Infallibility* is lodged in your *Church*; whether in *Pope* or *Council*, or both together. I suppose it can be no news either to you, or to the Reader, what *Controversies* there are among the greatest of your side, whether the *Pope* or *Council* be the greater, and to whom this *Infallibility* belongs; neither are either side fully agreed in their own way, for some that are for the *Infallibility* of a General *Council*, will make that *Infallible* without the *Pope*,

Pope, others account that opinion, if not Heretical, the next step to it. Those who are for the Pope's Infallibility, are not agreed neither when he shall be said to be Infallible; They who speak Oracles, tell us, when he doth define *ex Cathedra*, but what that is, neither they nor we can well tell; Some say it is, when he hath a Congregation of chosen Cardinals about him, others make the whole Colledge of Cardinals necessary, and therefore some in the late Definition concerning the Jansenists were refractory, because it was defined only by a Congregation of chosen Cardinals, which they said, was not defining *ex Cathedra*: Some again make neither of these necessary, but suppose the Infallibility lodged in the Pope himself. And are we not at a fine pass for the certainty of our Faith, if it must rely upon the infallible Testimony of your Church; and yet you your selves not at all agreed to whom this Infallible Testimony doth belong? Think not that we will be put off with that silly Evasion, *That these Differences among you hinder not the certainty of Faith, because it is not de fide either way*. For, 1. How shall we come to know among you what is *de fide*, and what not, till you are agreed to whom this Infallibility belongs? And if it belongs to a General Council, then it is *de fide*; for it was determined at the Council of Basil, in behalf of the Council, and therefore if one of the Opinions be true, it must be *de fide*; for, I suppose you make that to be so, which is determined by the infallible Testimony of your Church. 2. How shall a Man believe, that any thing at all is *de fide* among you, if that on which your Faith is to rest, be not *de fide*? For, supposing a Difference to happen, which hath often done between the Pope and Council, and they decree contrary things to each other, if it be not *de fide*, to believe either the one or the other distinctly to be infallible, upon what Testimony at such a time must that which supposeth the infallible Testimony of your Church rely? 3. If it be said not to be *de fide*, because not determined; by the same reason your Churches Infallibility cannot be *de fide*, because not determined neither: For, if the Determination of the Church be necessary to make any thing *de fide*, it must by the same reason be necessary to make your Churches Infallibility *de fide*; and, I suppose, you will not readily instance in any Decree of the Catholick Church, where the Testimony of your Church is determined to be Infallible. And yet one would imagine, that if there were such a necessity in order to Faith, of the Infallible Testimony of your Church, there would be an equal necessity of believing this Infallibility on the same Testimony: Or if one may believe one Article, especially so important a one as that, without any precedent Infallible Testimony, why not any other, nay, why not all the rest? Thus you still see, how Uncertainties grow upon us, when we search into your account of Faith.

3. You are not certain neither, *What kind of Infallibility this is*; For you offer to prove the Church Infallible, by the same way that Moses, Christ, and his Apostles were proved Infallible: A very fair Offer, if you could make it good; but then we were in hopes you would have proved such a kind of Infallibility as they had; you tell us, No: For your Infallibility is Supernatural, but not Divine; that it is precise Infallibility, but not absolute,; that it is not by immediate Revelation, but by immediate Assistance of the Holy Ghost: Something you would have, but you cannot tell what; an Infallibility in the Conclusion, without any in the use of means; an Infallibility by immediate Assistance of the Holy Ghost, yet but in a sort Divine; an Infallibility yielding nothing to Scripture in point of Supernaturality and Certainty, yet nothing so Infallible as Scripture. Are not these brave things to make wise Men certain in their Religion with! that they are to believe the Scriptures upon a Testi-

Testimony *infallible*, yet not *infallible*; *divine*, yet not *divine*; and therefore *certain*, but not *certain*; *true*, but not *true*. But of the silliness of these Distinctions, afterwards. But, can you think to persuade wise or rational men to believe their Religion on such terms as these are? Had they no other evidence than what you give them, would they not be shrewdly tempted to reject all Religion, as a meer *Imposture*, as no doubt your Doctrine of *Infallibility* is? A strange kind of *Talisman*, which secures your Pope from a possibility of erring, but still he must be under the *certain direction of his Stars*; for, if he be not *in Cathedra*, this *Telefm* doth him no good at all. It were heartily to be wished, if he should once happen to be *in Cathedra*, he would infallibly determine what it was to be *in Cathedra* for ever after; for it would ease Mens minds of a great many troublesome scruples, which they cannot, without some infallible Determination, get themselves quit of. But still we are bound to believe your Church *Infallible*: But, I pray, whence comes this *Infallibility*? Comes it from Heaven, or is it of Men? From Heaven, no doubt, you say; for it is by a promise of the Holy Ghost. This were something, if it were proved; but yet you maintain this *Infallibility* in such a manner, that none who read the Scriptures could ever think, it were promised there. For there they always read, *That the Spirit of Truth is a Spirit of Holiness, and never dwells in those who are carnal or wicked men*; but, you tell us: That let the lives of Popes be what they will; they have no promise to secure them from being *wicked*, but the Spirit of God doth by immediate Assistance secure them from being *fallible*. But, I pray, which of these two is not only more contrary to Scripture, but to Humane Nature; *Wickedness* or *Fallibility*? This latter, so consequent upon the imperfection of our understandings, that, till we put off the one, we can hardly be freed from the other; but *Wickedness* is that which the whole design of *Christian Religion* is against, and administers the highest *Motives*, and the greatest *Assistance* for the conquest of; and can it then be thought suitable to such a *Doctrine*, that the Divine Spirit should, like *Mahomet's Dove*, be always ready to whisper in the ear of the most profligate Person, if it be but his fortune to sit in *Cathedra*? Such a kind of *Infallibility* as this, I assure you, will never prevail with any such persons, who understand *Christian Religion*, to believe the *Doctrine* of it upon such pretences as yours are.

4. Supposing, you could tell Men intelligibly and suitably to the Doctrine of *Christianity*, What kind of *infallibility* this is; yet if you cannot satisfy them, when your Church doth define infallibly, you leave them still in the same *Labyrinth*, without any clue to direct them out of it. But, if we consider what things are necessary to be believed, before we can believe any definition of your Church *infallible*, how impossible it is to be *infallibly assured* of any such definition of your Church, sure you cannot blame us for crying out of the *Labyrinth* you have brought us into. §. 10.

1. How many things in *Christian Religion* are to be believed, before we can imagine any such thing as an *infallible Testimony of your Church*? And if the *Infallibility* of that be the ground of Faith, on what account must those things be believed, which are antecedent to the belief of such an *infallible Testimony*? Now, that many things, and some of them far from being clear, are to be believed antecedently to an *infallible Testimony*, will appear; if we do but consider what they commonly mean by that Church, which they suppose *infallible*, and what must be supposed, that this *Infallibility* be the Rule of Faith. By the Church, they tell you, they mean the *Catholick Church*: but lest you should think them too honest in saying so, at next word

word it is, the *Roman Catholick Church* (just as if one should say the *German-Universal Emperour*.) But lest you should think at least they meant the *Roman Church of all Ages*, and think you might have some relief from the *Primitive Roman Church*, they will soon rectifie your mistakes, by telling you, it is the *present Roman Church* they mean; but if it be the *present Roman Church*, it may be you would be willing to hear the judgment of *all the honest Men in that Church*, and that you hope many of the people and learned Men (not in Orders) may speak their minds freely. To prevent that, they tell you they mean only the *representative Church*. But still the *Bishops*, who make up this *representative Church*, may in their several *Synods* complain of abuses, and rectifie miscarriages; therefore they understand not *Bishops by themselves*, or *particular Synods*, but met together in *General Councils*. But yet, if the *Councils* were truly *Oecumenical*, there might be some hopes of redress. But for that they are sure; for they allow none to be members of the *General Councils*, which are in *Schism* or *Herefie*; and their own *Church* is to be Judge, what *Schism* and *Herefie* is; and they are hugely to blame then, if they admit any but those of their own party. But yet, some *Councils* have stood upon their privileges in opposition to the *Pope*, as those of *Constance* and *Basil*. Therefore, to make all sure, no *Council* is lawful in it self, or its decrees bind the *Church*, but such as is call'd and confirmed by the *Pope*: who is strangely to blame then, if he suffers any thing to pass to his own prejudice: So that this *Infallibility* of the *Pope*, is the last resort in the resolution of *Faith*; for all the rest, we see, are uncertain. And what a vast measure of *Faith* (greater than that which our *Saviour* said, would remove mountains) is necessary to believe this *Infallibility* of the *Pope*? for in the first place, unless he believes the particular *Roman Church* to be the *Catholick Church*, he spoils all the *Conjuring* afterwards, with not having *Faith* enough about him. Again, he must believe, that *Christ* hath promised an *Infalible Assistance* to the *Pastors of the Church as distinct from the People*; but this avails little still, unless he believes these *Credentials* must not be opened, but in *full Council*; and that *Council* such a one as the *Pope* calls, and in which *himself presides*, either in *Person*, or by his *Legates*, and that the *Decrees* of the *Council* oblige not the *Church*, without the *Pope's Confirmation*; and to that end you must believe, that *S. Peter* was made *Monarch of the Church by Christ*; that this *Monarchy* was to be derived to all his *Successors* in all places; but as to this (wherever he was besides) he never had any *Successor*, any where but at *Rome*: And these *Successors* of his at *Rome*, cannot for their *lives* err, if they do but sit in *Cathedra*. Certainly he that hath *Faith* to swallow all these things, is hugely to blame if he stick at any thing; and by that time a Man's understanding is *debauch'd* sufficiently by these Principles, I make no question but such a one will believe *Infallibility*, *Transubstantiation*, or any thing in the world. But beside these things, in order to the making the *Churches Testimony the Rule of Faith* to any one, there must another dose of Principles be taken, which have *Opium* enough in them to lay asleep all the remainders of reason: For he must infallibly believe the *Church* to be *infalible*, though no *infalible Argument* be brought for the proof of it; That this *Church* doth judicially and authoritatively pronounce her *Sentence* in matters of *Faith*, though we know not what that *Church* is, which must so pronounce; That he infallibly know that this particular *Sentence* was so pronounced, though he can have no other than *Moral Means* of knowing it; And lastly, That the *Infallibility* must be the first thing believed, although all these things must of necessity be believed before it. And if after this *second Purgation*, he be not a true Son of the *Church of Rome*,

he

he deserves to be *Anathematized* as an obstinate Person, for having any thing of *Reason* in him. Therefore I wonder not that the Doctrine of *Infallibility* seems no strange thing to you; for a Man must devour such *Giant-like Absurdities*, before he comes to it, that when he comes at it, he finds it nothing. But still, one would think it a little strange, that this *Infallibility* should be the only *Foundation* of believing all things in *Religion*; and yet so many things; and some of them very *strange ones*, must of necessity be certainly believed before it.

2. Supposing a Man not only believes all these things before it, but doth really believe your Church *Infallible*, yet he is *uncertain* still how he should know when your Church defines *Infallibly*. For so many things are required in reference to the Person defining, so many for the definition it self, that it will be no easie matter to remove those difficulties which lie in the way of his Assent to such a Definition. As to the Person, if he be not a *Christian*, if he be not a *Priest*, if not a *Lawful Pope*, all his *Definitions* are far from being *Infallible*; yet none of all these can any one be assured of according to your Principles of the intention of the Priest being necessary in the Administration of Sacraments, in order to the effect of them. (But the large train of Consequences following from hence, I forbear to urge you with, because they have been so often urged by *abler Pens.*) But, What will you say, when we are so far from assurance, as to the Pope's being legally chosen, that we have, if not great Evidence, yet very high Presumptions of the contrary, what becomes then of your Pope's *Infallibility*? Nay, from the *Illegality* of one, follows the *Illegality* of all his Successors, because they were chosen by *Cardinals*, made by him; who could be no lawful *Cardinals*, because he was no *legal Pope*, and consequently not they who were made by them. The case is this; There is a Bull of Pope Julius the Second, against the *Simoniack Election* of any Pope, which the *Cardinals*, upon their first entrance into the *Conclave*, swear solemnly to observe. In which Bull it is expressly said, That if any Pope be *Simoniackally chosen* by any of the *Cardinals*, upon any gift or promise whatsoever, that such an Election is ipso facto null; and the *Cardinals* may oppose one so chosen, as if guilty of manifest *Heretic*; and that none ought to receive or look on such a one as Pope; neither can this *Simoniack Election* be made good by *intronization*, course of time, submission of *Cardinals*, &c. And that they ought all to avoid him as a *Magician*, *Heathen*, *Publican*, or the *Founder of Heretic*. This is the substance of that Bull. Now it is notoriously known, that Sixtus the Fifth, was *Simoniackally chosen* Pope. For, that he might be chosen, he did under his hand promise to Cardinal d'Este, who had a great interest in the *Conclave*, that in the time of his *Popedom*, he would never create Jerome Matthew, the *Cardinal's* great Enemy, a *Cardinal*: Upon which promise he was through his interest chosen Pope. But, when afterwards the Pope violated his Faith to him, by creating his Enemy *Cardinal*; d'Este, being highly incensed against him for it, sent the very Instrument subscribed by the Pope's own hand, to Philip the Second King of Spain, who in the Year 1589, sent the Duke of *Suisse* extraordinary *Em-*
bassadour to Rome, to intimate to Sixtus the Fifth, his intention of calling a
General Council, according to the Bull of Julius the Second, for declaring this
Simoniack Election. When this Message was delivered to the Pope, and he
saw the Instrument was discovered under his own hand, he fell into such a
perplexity, that he died soon after, which stopt the progress of the *Business*.
By this it evidently appears, that Sixtus himself was no lawful Pope, and
therefore could create no *Cardinals*: And, because the *Cardinals* created by
him, had a voice in the Election of the subsequent Popes; it follows, That

R

there

V. Suppli-
cat. ad Im-
perat. Reg.
Princip. su-
per causis
generalis
Concilii
convocandi
contra Pau-
lum 5.
Lond.
1613.

there hath been no legal Pope since *Sixtus the fifth*. For, after the death of *Sixtus*, Cardinal *Montalto* his Nephew, with forty Votes entred the Conclave, and chose *Urban the Seventh*, who lived but few days; after him *Gregory the Fourteenth*, who was Pope but ten Months: After him *Innocentius the Ninth*, who continued but two Months; after him *Clement the Eighth*, who out-lived the Election thirteen Years. But not to enquire any further into the irregular Election, and the *Simoniackal Bargains* of *Paul the Fifth*, after the death of *Clement*; this certainly may suffice to let Men see, what becomes of their Faith, when they pin it upon the Pope's Sleeve: For, if we are to rely upon his infallible Testimony, and he so far from being *Infallible*, that by their own Constitutions he was no Pope, nor to be looked on as other than a Magician, Heathen, and Heretick, is not our Faith then settled on a sure Foundation? For what assurance can any one have, that amidst all the Enormities, and secret Practices of the Conclave, any one is freely and legally chosen? But, Where will his Faith stand, when it is notorious, that a Cardinal must say, *Dabo tibi claves*, and that not without a Contract too? But, suppose all the assurance that may be of the Person who is to deliver this *Infallible Testimony*; yet at the utmost, the most Men in the World can have no more than a Moral Certainty of the Definition it self. If we can imagine, that any one should know that great Mystery, when the Pope should define *ex Cathedra*; yet, can he have any greater evidence of such a Definition, than we have concerning the things revealed in Scripture? I cannot think that you will suppose any greater evidence of it, than if one sees and hears it; and, what do we desire less in reference to the Doctrine of Christ? But how few in the World are there, who stand by, when the Pope defines? May others be certain of such a Definition or no, so as to be obliged to believe it? If not, What good can this *Infallibility* do them? If they may, Why do you quarrel with our way as uncertain? When if you grant your *Infallibility*, you cannot prescribe any more certain way, but one much more liable to question and dispute than ours is: Thus you see what little advantage you get by all these Bravado's about *Infallibility*; and that you are so far from giving a satisfactory account of Faith, that you expose Christian Religion to more doubts, scruples, and uncertainties, than ever before. Which may abundantly shew to all unprejudiced Minds, the great unreasonableness of your way of resolving Faith, which was the thing to be proved.

S. 11.

2. But, suppose your way to be never so reasonable, yet if it effect not that it was brought for, it deserves little favour from inquisitive Persons, and that I now come to evince, viz. That supposing your Church *Infallible*, and that *Infallibility* proved by the Motives of Credibility, you do not escape the Circle objected against your way. And really, whosoever considers your way of management of things, will find, that though you give out great words, and pretend to prove the Churches *Infallibility*, as *Moses* and *Christ's* was proved; yet your eye was all the while on nothing but the Circle, and thought, if you could get rid of that, you should do well enough with any thing else. For, as though this Circle had ridden you like an *Ephialtes*, you tumble, and groan, and toss this way and that, and when you think your self free from it, it sits as close upon you as ever. When you come so miserably off with the Proofs of your Churches *Infallibility*, you satisfy your self with this; 'Tis sufficient for the present to have declared how the Catholics fall not into a Circle, as his Lordship here pretends they do. Though this could not be sufficient for your design, who had promised in the Page foregoing, to prove at large the *Infallibility* of the Church; yet you had done somewhat, if you had done this, which, if I much mistake not, you are as much to seek in,

as in the Proofs of your Churches Infallibility. And that I prove by three things, from the nature of that Faith whose Resolution you promise, from the Persons you prove it to, from the nature of that Infallibility which you attempt to prove.

1. From the nature of that Faith you are enquiring a resolution for, which is not that which you call a *Humane Faith*, but a *Divine Faith*. When you go about to prove the Churches Infallibility, by the Motives of Credibility, is it a *Divine Faith* or no, which may be built on these Motives? Chuse which part you please. If it be, then by your own Confession, a *Divine Faith* may be built on *Prudential Motives*; if it be not, then what is all this to the purpose? For the Question is not, Whether by any other kind of Assent you cannot avoid the circle; but, Whether in the resolution of *Divine Faith* you can or no? For, I hope, you deny not, but the Scriptures and the Churches Infallibility are both to be believed with the same kind of Assent; built upon an *Infallible Testimony*; in this case I then ask, Why, with a *Divine Faith*, you believe the Scriptures to be the Word of God? You answer, Because the Church, which is Infallible, delivers them so to us. If I then ask, Why with a *Divine Faith* you believe the Churches Infallibility? Answer me if you can, any other way, than because the Scriptures, which are infallible, say so. And thus you see, it is only your running away from the Question, makes you think your self out of the Circle, and not any satisfactory Answer to it. Will you, or dare you say, that is an Assent of the same nature, which is built on the Motives of Credibility, with that which is grounded on an *Infallible Testimony*? If it be not, bethink your self of a new Answer: If it be, bethink your self of a new Way to oppose us, and not to think it sufficient to charge us with building *Divine Faith* on *Prudential Motives*, when you do it your self. But, if you should assert that to be a *Divine Faith*, which is built on the Motives of Credibility, you not only contradict your self, but the great Ones of your own Party. For your Becanus saith, That these Motives are the Foundation only of a prudent Assent, but not Infallible; and Valentia goes much higher, and tells us, The Faith grounded on these Motives is not Divine, or infused, but acquiste, that it is in its nature uncertain and fallible; that it cannot be the Foundation of Christian Faith. If this be true, To what end do you go about to resolve Faith upon such Uncertainties, in hopes to escape the Circle you see others in? This you see, how insufficient your Attempt is, because you speak not of the same kind of Assent, as to the Scripture, and the Church.

2. You avoid not the Circle by the different considerations of the Persons you offer to prove the Infallibility of the Church and Scripture to. You tell us, That when you prove the Infallibility of the Church by Scripture, you make use only of Arguments ad hominem, and argue ex principiis concessis against Sectaries, who deny the Infallibility of your Church, but admit the Divine Authority of the Scriptures, and therefore you may justly use Scripture-arguments against them. I grant it: But still I say, you avoid not the Circle by this Subterfuge neither. For, 1. The question is not, Which way you will prove the Infallibility of the Church against those who deny it; but which way you resolve your own Faith of the Churches Infallibility? Therefore this signifies nothing at all as to your Question about the Resolution of Faith; for I suppose you build not that on any thing which your Adversary grants or denies. Is there no difference between the way of proving a thing to an Adversary, and the resolving one's own Faith? I question not, but you may dispute with him upon Principles he grants and you deny; but, I should think you no wise Man to build your Faith upon such Principles. So that this Eva-

sion comes not near the business. 2. Even in disputing against your *Adversaries* you cannot avoid the *Circle*; which I thus prove. You offer to prove to them the *Church* to be *Infallible* out of *Scripture*; for this you bring them particular places, and think presently to vanquish them with, *Super hanc Petram, Pasce oves, & Dabo tibi claves*; but hence ariseth another Question, How you come infallibly to know, that this is the *sense* of those places? You know, your *Adversaries* presently deny any such as *Infallibility* to be proved out of them. And, what way have you to assure them, this is the *sense* of them, but because your *Church*, which is *Infallible*, delivers this to be the *sense* of them? And is not this then a plain *Circle*? You are to believe the *Church* infallible, because the *Scripture* saith so; and you are to believe the *Scripture* saith so, because the *Church* is *Infallible*. If this be not still a plain *Circle*, you may question whether there be any such Figure in *Mathematicks*.

3. I prove you cannot avoid the *Circle* from your own Confession of the nature of that *Infallibility*, which you say is in the *Church*. For you tell us, P. 58. n. 4. That the *Churches* Testimony doth not suppose any new Revelation from God, but only a supernatural Assistance of the Holy Ghost, preserving her from all Error in defining the Points of Christian Faith. By this Assertion, you destroy all possibility of avoiding the *Circle* by the *Motives of Credibility*; for if these had proved an immediate Divine Revelation in the *Church*, I confess you had proved the *Churches* *Infallibility* independently on *Scripture*; but, when you offer to prove only a Divine Assistance with the *Church*, in delivering former Revelations, you cannot, and the reason is, because you can bring no ground at all why such an Assistance should be necessary in the *Church*; or why it should be expected but from the Promises made in *Scripture* concerning such an Assistance of God's Spirit to be with the *Church*: And therefore the utmost your *Motives of Credibility* can pretend to, is only to notify that *Church* from others, which you suppose *Infallible*: But still the formal Reason of your believing this *Infallibility*, cannot be from those *Motives*, but upon those Promises which you suppose to import such an Assistance of the Holy Ghost with the *Church*, which shall secure her from Error: So that still the *Circle* returns upon you: For, you believe the *Scriptures* *Infallible*, because of the *Churches* Testimony; and you believe the *Church* *Infallible*, because of the Promises in *Scripture* concerning the Assistance of the Holy Ghost with the *Church*, so as to secure her from all Error. And thus, I hope, I have made good this general Attempt upon your way of resolving Faith, by manifesting the great unreasonableness, and manifest insufficiency of it.

§. 12. I now come to handle the particulars of this Chapter, which consists of two things, *Proofs* and *Evasions*, the *Proofs* you produce for your *Churches* *Infallibility*, and your *Evasions* as to those Arguments which are objected by his Lordship. Both of these will deserve our Consideration; and if it appear, that your *Proofs* are weak, and your *Evasions* silly, you will have no great cause to triumph in this Attempt of yours. As to your *Proofs*, two things are considerable, your Method of proving, and the *Proofs* themselves. I begin with the first, which you deliver in these words. Wherefore, as to the last demand (in which only there is difficulty) viz. How we know the *Church* to be *Infallibly* governed by the Holy Ghost; we answer, that we prove it first in general, not by the *Scripture*, but by the *Motives of Credibility*, which belong to the *Church*, in the same manner as the *Infallibility* of Moses, and other Prophets, of Christ and his Apostles was proved, which was by the Miracles they wrought, and by other Signs of an *Infallible* Spirit, Direction, and Guidance from God, which appeared in them. Whence it is clear, that we in-
cur

cur no Circle. That, supposing all that true which you said before, yet thereby you avoid not the Circle, I shall take it for granted, I have already proved, till you better inform me: Our Business now therefore is, to consider, which way you prove this *Infallibility* of your Church, which you tell us, is not by Scripture (for which I commend your Ingenuity) but by the *Motives of Credibility*. But, lest any should think this a weak way of Probation, you tell us, *It is in the same manner that the Infallibility of all Persons divinely inspired was proved, not excepting Christ himself.* A most heroic and generous Attempt! For which the Church of Rome is infinitely obliged to you, if you make it good: For then it necessarily follows, that there is as great danger in not believing the *Infallibility* of your Church, as in not believing Moses and the Prophets, Christ and his Apostles. For, where there is an equal Obligation to believe, there is an equal Sin in not believing; and where the Sin is equal, it stands to reason that the Punishment should be so too. I suppose you deny not, but, Where there are equal Motives inducing to believe, there results an equal Obligation to Faith, because the Grounds obliging to assent, can be no other than the Motives inducing to it; and if these Motives be as strong and evident for your Churches *Infallibility*, as for that of Moses and Christ, Men must be as much obliged now to believe your Church *Infallible*, as, that Moses and Christ were so: So that the denial of your Churches *Infallibility*, must needs be accounted by you to be as high a piece of *Infidelity*, as if one should call in question the *Infallibility* of Christ himself, for you assert, That you have the same Proofs for the *Infallibility* of your Church, which there were to prove him *Infallible*. I do not therefore wonder at your Sharpness and Severity in your Censures of all out of your Church, when upon your Principles, the denying your Churches *Infallibility*, must needs be an offence of as high a nature, as if one denied the *Infallibility* of the Sacred Scriptures. But, lest you should not think these any Absurdities at all, we must come yet closer to the examination of your Proofs: For which we must enquire into these two things. 1. Whether the same Motives of Credibility belong to your Church, by which Moses and the Prophets, Christ and his Apostles, shewed their Testimony to be *Infallible*. 2. Whether, on supposition you had the same Motives, there were the same reason to believe the Testimony of your Church *Infallible*, as there was to believe them to be so.

1. Whether the same Motives of Credibility belong to your Church or no. And here again, these things offer themselves to consideration. 1. By what means their Testimony was proved *Infallible*. 2. Whether your Churches Testimony can be proved by the same Motives or no. For the first, you are pleased to give us this account, *Why Moses was accounted Infallible; for the Israelites seeing Moses to be a Person very devout, mild, charitable, and chaste, and endowed with the gift of working Miracles, were upon that ground obliged to receive him for a true Prophet; and to believe him Infallible, by acknowledging as true and certain, whatever he proposed to them from God.* All which I acknowledge to be very true; but am much to seek, how you will apply it to the proving your Churches *Infallibility*. What kind of Miracles those are which your Church pretends to, will be examined afterwards; the other Motives of Credibility mentioned, are Devotion, Mildness, Charity, and Chastity; and these, I suppose, you look on as those Motives, which must induce Men to believe the *Infallibility* of your Church. But, do you really think, that every Person who is devout, mild, charitable, and chaste, is therefore *Infallible*? If not, to what purpose do you produce them here? If you do, some out of your Church may be as *Infallible* as those in it.

it. Especially, if your *Superstitious Ceremonies* be the greatest part of your *Devotion*; and your *burning of Hereticks*, the Argument of your *Mildness*; and your *Damning all out of your Church*, be the best evidence of your *Charity*; and the *Lives of your Popes*, the most pregnant *Instances* of your *Churches Chastity*. The rest of your Discourse, wherein you endeavour after your way, to prove that there were sufficient *Motives of Credibility*, to believe the *Testimony of Christ and his Apostles*, I suppose no Christian will deny; and that the *Miracles wrought by them*, were *Proofs that their Testimony was Infallible*, I am so far from questioning, that all your other *Motives* signifie nothing without them. Which, because it hath so great an influence on the present Dispute, I think it necessary to be a little further cleared, than it is by you, and chiefly for this end, to let you see, how much you have befooled your self in attempting to prove the *Infallibility of your Church*, in the same manner that *Christ and his Apostles Infallibility was proved in*, and yet insisting on that of *Miracles*, as the great evidence of their *Infallibility*, which your Church cannot with any face pretend to. I acknowledge it then as a great Truth, that it was necessary, that the *Testimony* of all such who pretend to be *Infallible*, must be confirmed by such *Miracles as Christ and his Apostles wrought*; nay, that it is impossible, without such *Evidence*, to prove any *Testimony infallible*, where that *Infallibility* is pretended to, independently upon *Scripture*, as it is in your present case. Which will be thus made evident: *Absolute Infallibility* is not consistent with the *shortness* of the *humane Understanding*, for such an *Infallibility* must suppose an *Infinity of Knowledge*; for, where there is a defect in the *Apprehension*, there is a possibility of *deception*; therefore only an *Infinite Being* can be *absolutely Infallible*. Now, *Man's Understanding* being so *finite*, and limited in its Conceptions, it is on that account apt to be imposed upon, and to form false *Notions* of things; so that supposing no Being in the World of greater Perfections than *Man* is, there never could be any such thing as *Infallibility* among Men. For, though some Men's *Understandings* might outstrip others in the quickness of Conception, and solidity of Judgment; yet the *Nature of Man* being thus *finite*, that presumption would lie against all pretence of *Infallibility*. It being then impossible, that *Man's Understanding* should be in it self *Infallible*, we must consider, whether there be a possibility it should receive any *Infallibility* from that *Infinite Being*, which is above it. This then must be taken for granted, that as an *Infinite Understanding* cannot be deceived, so *Infinite Goodness* cannot deceive. And therefore, whatever doth immediately proceed from a *Being infinitely Wise and Good*, cannot but be *infallibly true*. And there is no repugnancy at all in the nature of the thing, but that this *Infinite Being* may, in a way certain, but imperceptible by us, communicate to the *Minds of Men* such *Notions* of things, which are the effects of his own *Wisdom and Counsel*: And this is that we call *Divine Inspiration*. But then we are still to consider, That the understanding of a *finite Creature*, cannot be any further *Infallible*, than as it receives those *Notions* which are imprinted upon it by the *Infinite and Supreme Intellect* of the World; and such a Person is no further *Infallible* in what he speaks, than as he delivers to the World those *very Conceptions*, which are thus formed in his Mind. And this is that which the *Apostle* means when he says, That *Holy Men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost*. And so far as they were thus moved, so far they were *Infallible*, and no further. But this *Infallibility* being not intended meerly for the satisfaction of the *Mind of him* that hath it, but for the general *Good* of the *World*, it is necessary that there be some way whereby Men may come to understand who are

are *Infallibly assisted*, and who not. For otherwise the World would be more exposed to *Delusions* under this *Pretext of Infallibility*; than if there were never any such thing in the World. Either therefore every Man must be *infallibly assured* in his *Mind*, that such a Person is infallible in what he is to deliver, which is a needless piece of *Enthusiasm*; or else such *external Evidences* of it are to be used, which may induce all rational and considerative Persons to the belief of it. Which is the way that God in his *infinite Wisdom* hath made choice of; by making those very Persons, whose Understandings are thus assisted by him, to be the *Instruments* of doing some things above the power of Nature. And nothing can be more reasonable, than to believe their Testimony true, who are employed as such immediate *Instruments of Divine Power*; and if their Testimony be believed true, their *Doctrine* must be *Infallible*; for the greatest part of their Testimony is, That they deliver not their *Doctrines* from themselves, but immediately from God. And consequently their Testimony must be owned as *Infallible*, in whatever they deliver as from God; it being very unreasonable to think, that God would favour such Persons with so extraordinary a Power, who should falsifie their Message, and deceive the World. Thus you see, that whatever *Motives of Credibility* you would blind the World with, there can be no *Motive* independent on *Scripture*, which is sufficient to prove *Infallibility*, but such a power of working *Miracles*, which Moses, and the Prophets, and Christ, and his Apostles had, which last, as you truly say, received their Commission from Christ to Preach every where, and to confirm their words with Signs that followed; by which Signs, all their Hearers were bound to submit themselves unto them, and to acknowledge their words for *infallible Oracles of Truth*. P. 36. n. 2.

Now, What reasonable Man could otherwise expect, but that after you had so solemnly promised to prove the *Infallibility* of your Church, in the very same manner that Moses, with other Prophets, Christ and his Apostles were first proved to be *Infallible*, which are twice your words; and your large shewing, That the main ground why they were believed *Infallible*, was, because of the *Miracles* wrought by them, whence they needed not the Testimony of *Scripture*: You should have shewed us what kind of parallel *Miracles* are wrought in your Church, to prove its *Infallibility*. But, instead of that, when you come to the purpose, you shuffle us off, in a most ridiculous and impertinent manner: For, you tell us, That as therefore Moses, our Blessed Saviour, and his Apostles, were proved *Infallible* by their Works, Signs, and Miracles, without *Scripture*; so is the Church without help of the same sufficiently proved to be *Infallible* by the *Motives of Credibility*. Well, but what, and where are these *Motives of Credibility*? Are they of the same kind and nature with the *Signs* and *Miracles* wrought by them or not? If not, How can the way and manner be the same, which you promised to prove the Churches *Infallibility*? If not, What assurance can you give us, that those will prove *Infallibility*, as well as their Works and Miracles? This should have been demonstrated; and those *Motives* produced to the view of the World, if you had designed any other than *juggling* with your Readers. Instead of this, you tell us, That *Hereticks*, though they have the *Scripture*, yet being out of the true Church, they do wholly want these *Signs of Infallibility*: Of which, see Bellarmine, and other Catholic Authors discoursing more at large, de notis Ecclesiæ. 'Tis sufficient for the present, to have declared how Catholics fall not into a Circle, as his Lordship pretends they do. These are excellent ways of proof, and fit only for a Church that pretends to be *Infallible*, and then most of all, when her *Infallibility* was to be proved. What

it. Especially, if your *Superstitious Ceremonies* be the greatest part of your *Devotion*; and your *burning of Hereticks*, the Argument of your *Mildness*; and your *Damning all out of your Church*, be the best evidence of your *Charity*; and the *Lives of your Popes*, the most pregnant *Instances* of your *Churches Chastity*. The rest of your Discourse, wherein you endeavour after your way, to prove that there were sufficient *Motives of Credibility*, to believe the *Testimony of Christ and his Apostles*, I suppose no Christian will deny; and that the *Miracles wrought by them*, were *Proofs* that their *Testimony was Infallible*, I am so far from questioning, that all your other *Motives* signifie nothing without them. Which, because it hath so great an influence on the present Dispute, I think it necessary to be a little further cleared, than it is by you, and chiefly for this end, to let you see, how much you have befooled your self in attempting to prove the *Infallibility of your Church*, in the same manner that *Christ and his Apostles Infallibility* was proved in, and yet insisting on that of *Miracles*, as the great evidence of their *Infallibility*, which your Church cannot with any face pretend to. I acknowledge it then as a great Truth, that it was necessary, that the *Testimony* of all such who pretend to be *Infallible*, must be confirmed by such *Miracles as Christ and his Apostles* wrought; nay, that it is impossible, without such *Evidence*, to prove any *Testimony* infallible, where that *Infallibility* is pretended to, independently upon *Scripture*, as it is in your present case. Which will be thus made evident: *Absolute Infallibility* is not consistent with the shortness of the humane *Understanding*, for such an *Infallibility* must suppose an *Infinity of Knowledge*; for, where there is a defect in the *Apprehension*, there is a possibility of *deception*; therefore only an *Infinite Being* can be absolutely *Infallible*. Now, *Man's Understanding* being so finite, and limited in its Conceptions, it is on that account apt to be imposed upon, and to form false *Notions* of things; so that supposing no Being in the World of greater Perfections than *Man* is, there never could be any such thing as *Infallibility* among Men. For, though some Men's *Understandings* might outstrip others in the quickness of Conception, and solidity of Judgment; yet the *Nature of Man* being thus finite, that presumption would lie against all pretence of *Infallibility*. It being then impossible, that *Man's Understanding* should be in it self *Infallible*, we must consider, whether there be a possibility it should receive any *Infallibility* from that *Infinite Being*, which is above it. This then must be taken for granted, that as an *Infinite Understanding* cannot be deceived, so *Infinite Goodness* cannot deceive. And therefore, whatever doth immediately proceed from a *Being infinitely Wise and Good*, cannot but be infallibly true. And there is no repugnancy at all in the nature of the thing, but that this *Infinite Being* may, in a way certain, but imperceptible by us, communicate to the *Minds of Men* such *Notions* of things, which are the effects of his own *Wisdom and Counsel*: And this is that we call *Divine Inspiration*. But then we are still to consider, That the understanding of a finite Creature, cannot be any further *Infallible*, than as it receives those *Notions* which are imprinted upon it by the *Infinite and Supreme Intellect* of the World; and such a Person is no further *Infallible* in what he speaks, than as he delivers to the World those very *Conceptions*, which are thus formed in his Mind. And this is that which the *Apostle* means when he says, That *Holy Men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost*. And so far as they were thus moved, so far they were *Infallible*, and no further. But this *Infallibility* being not intended meerly for the satisfaction of the Mind of him that hath it, but for the general Good of the World, it is necessary that there be some way whereby Men may come to understand who are

are *Infallibly assisted*, and who not. For otherwise the World would be more exposed to *Delusions* under this *Pretext of Infallibility*; than if there were never any such thing in the World. Either therefore every Man must be *infallibly assured* in his *Mind*, that such a Person is infallible in what he is to deliver, which is a needless piece of *Enthusiasm*; or else such *external Evidences* of it are to be used, which may induce all rational and considerative Persons to the belief of it. Which is the way that God in his *infinite Wisdom* hath made choice of; by making those very Persons, whose Understandings are thus assisted by him, to be the *Instruments* of doing some things above the power of Nature. And nothing can be more reasonable, than to believe their Testimony true, who are employed as such immediate *Instruments of Divine Power*; and if their Testimony be believed true, their *Doctrine* must be *Infallible*; for the greatest part of their Testimony is, That they deliver not their *Doctrines* from themselves, but immediately from God. And consequently their Testimony must be owned as *Infallible*, in whatever they deliver as from God; it being very unreasonable to think, that God would favour such Persons with so extraordinary a Power, who should falsify their Message, and deceive the World. Thus you see, that whatever *Motives of Credibility* you would blind the World with, there can be no Motive independent on Scripture, which is sufficient to prove *Infallibility*, but such a power of working Miracles, which Moses, and the Prophets, and Christ, and his Apostles had, which last, as you truly say, received their Commission from Christ to Preach every where, and to confirm their words with Signs that followed; by which Signs, all their Hearers were bound to submit themselves unto them, and to acknowledge their words for infallible Oracles of Truth. P. 56. n. 2.

Now, What reasonable Man could otherwise expect, but that after you had so solemnly promised to prove the *Infallibility* of your Church, in the very same manner that Moses, with other Prophets, Christ and his Apostles were first proved to be *Infallible*, which are twice your words; and your large shewing, That the main ground why they were believed *Infallible*, was, because of the Miracles wrought by them, whence they needed not the Testimony of Scripture: You should have shewed us what kind of parallel Miracles are wrought in your Church, to prove its *Infallibility*. But, instead of that, when you come to the purpose, you shuffle us off, in a most ridiculous and impertinent manner: For, you tell us, That as therefore Moses, our Blessed Saviour, and his Apostles, were proved *Infallible* by their Works, Signs, and Miracles, without Scripture; so is the Church without help of the same sufficiently proved to be *Infallible* by the *Motives of Credibility*. Well, but what, and where are these *Motives of Credibility*? Are they of the same kind and nature with the Signs and Miracles wrought by them, or not? If not, How can the way and manner be the same, which you promised to prove the Churches *Infallibility*? If not, What assurance can you give us, that those will prove *Infallibility*, as well as their Works and Miracles? This should have been demonstrated; and those *Motives* produced to the view of the World, if you had designed any other than *jugling* with your Readers. Instead of this, you tell us, That Hereticks, though they have the Scripture, yet being out of the true Church, they do wholly want these Signs of *Infallibility*: Of which, see Bellarmine, and other Catholick Authors discoursing more at large, de notis Ecclesiæ. 'Tis sufficient for the present, to have declared how Catholicks fall not into a Circle, as his Lordship pretends they do. These are excellent ways of proof, and fit only for a Church that pretends to be *Infallible*, and then most of all, when her *Infallibility* was to be proved. What S. 13.
P. 55. n. 1.
P. 56. n. 2.
P. 57.

What did you lead us this long dance for, if you never intended to prove your Church Infallible? Could you not have referred us to Bellarmine at first, as well as at last? Nay, and now you do turn us off to him, you bid us, go seek the *Notes of the Church*, and not the *Proofs of Infallibility*; which, sure, are different things, unless you suppose no Church true, but what is Infallible. But however, you are sure not to miss the *Heretics*, they must have a blow at parting, *They are out of the Church, and do wholly want these Signs of Infallibility*. What *Signs of Infallibility*? Speak out, and tell us, *what they are*, and *where they lie*, and *how they may be known*? For otherwise we may mistake in the *Physiognomy* of your Church, and instead of *Signs of Infallibility*, we may see shrewd *signs of Imposture and Delusion* in her. And it is the more suspicious, because you are so afraid of producing them after so solemn a promise to do it. However, you tell us, *'Tis sufficient for the present to have declared how Catholicks fall not into a Circle*: Well, I see, though we miss of the *Coals St. Laurence was broiled on*, we shall have a *Feather from the Wing of a Seraphim*; though you fail of your promise, we shall have something as good; and as great a feat of activity as that had been, *viz. to let us see, How the Papists dance in a Round, and yet make no Circle*. Your Demonstrations are so good in this kind, it is pity you do not imploy your excellent Wit in squaring *Mathematical Circles*, as well as *this*; and I shall as soon hope to see you perform the one as the other. But, can you, without smiling at our simplicity, tell us, (after such a wide-mouthed promise, as you made in the Page foregoing; But, because we have often promised to prove the Infallibility of the Church, it will be necessary to insist somewhat longer upon this Point, and declare the matter at large) That it is enough to vindicate your selves from the Circle? Was this the thing you promised, or the proofs of your Churches Infallibility? I confess *Quid feret hic tanto dignum promissor biatu?* came into my mind at first reading those words, and it proves accordingly. You really meant no such thing as proving your Church Infallible: And you are very excusable in it, though you had promised it; for no Promise can bind to Impossible. But it may be yet, though these Proofs do not come after the Promise, they may have gone before it; for I find before a large Catalogue mentioned of such Signs and Motives, which may prove the Churches Infallibility, as Sanctity of Life, Miracles, Efficacy, Purity and Excellency of Doctrine, fulfilling of Prophecies, Succession of lawfully sent Pastors, Unity, Antiquity, and the very name of Catholick, &c. Number enough, if that would do it. But we shall see what force these Motives are of by these following Queries.

P. 56. n. 2.

I. Is it all one with you, To know a Church to be true, and to make it Infallible? These you call the *Motives of Credibility* for your Churches Infallibility, were wont to be esteemed only the *Notes of Distinction* of the True Church from all others. The Question, I suppose, concerning these, had this rise. There being, after the Reformation, several distinct Societies of Men, pretending to be the True Christian Church, to which every Christian ought to associate himself; there was a necessity of pitching on some way, whereby the True Christian Church might be distinguished from other Communions; which begat a new Controversie, What were the proper Notes of this Society. Those of your Party, as Bellarmine tells you, differed much in the number of them: Some of which are those by you mentioned; but whether they be the True Notes of the Church or no, which hath been largely examined by others, What are these to the proof of Infallibility, setting aside that of Miracles? Is it not possible that there should be a

Society

Society of Men joyning together in the Profession of *Christian Religion*, but these Men must presently be *infallible* in whatever they deliver as the Sense of their Society? Their visible Profession of *Christian Religion*, makes them a *True Church*: but cannot Men seem to profess our Religion, unless they have a visible *Infallible Head* to guide them? Is *Infallibility* the Soul of a *Church*, which gives it its Being, I mean, a present *Infallibility* continually actuating and informing the *Body* of it? Cannot a Man be known to be a *True Man*, unless he be *inspired*? Nor a *Church* distinguished from other *Societies*, but by a *Spirit of Infallibility*? The truth is, Let *Bellarmino* multiply his *fifteen Notes of the Church* to *fifteen hundred*, if he please; nay, let it pretend to what *Infallibility* it please: if any Society of Men challenging the name of *Church* to it self, do destroy the end of its Constitution, or hold any thing directly contrary to the *Foundation* of its Institution; all other *Notes* in the world can never make it a *True Church*. So that the only certain *Note* of a *True Church*, is its *Agreement* with the primary *Foundation* of it in that *Doctrine* which was *Infallible*, and attested by *Miracles* undoubtedly *Divine*: That which holds the *Doctrine of Christ*, is the *Christian Church*; and the nearer any *Society* comes to that, the purer it is; the more it is distant from it, the more *impure*: and no Man who honours the *Christian Religion*, can be bound to communicate with the *Impurities* of such a *Church*, let it bear it never so high under the pretence of *infallibility*. If you boast never so much of your *Unity*, *Succession*, *Antiquity*, the name of *Catholic*, &c. if your *Doctrine* be repugnant to what was originally delivered by the Founder of the *Christian Church*; your *Society* is not the *True Christian Church*. But, suppose it were, and that it were known so to be by such *Notes* as these are; Can you not conceive a *Church* should be consonant to the *Doctrine of Christ*, but it must be it self *infallible* in deciding *Controversies*? Cannot you imagine a *Society* consisting of all *True Christians* in the world, should be made up of such persons who all firmly believe that *Doctrine infallible* which *Christ* delivered, but yet judge themselves all fallible, and dare not usurp that royal prerogative of *Heaven*, in prescribing *infallibly* in matters questioned, but leave all to judge according to the *Pandects* of the *Divine Laws*, because each member of this *Society* is bound to take care of his soul, and of all things that tend thereto? Is such an *Idea* of a *Christian Church*, a thing unreasonable, inconsistent, or contrary to any *Law* of its *Foundation*; or rather, is it not a very true and just representation of that *Society* of Men, which our blessed *Saviour* instituted as a *Church* in the world?

2. Do you mean, That these *Motives* should prove the *Christian Church* at large *infallible*, or your present particular universal *Church of Rome*? For some of your *Motives* seem to respect the one, and the rest the other, *Notion* of it. When you mention *miracles*, *efficacy*, *purity* and *excellency* of *Doctrine*, *fulfilling of Prophecies*, do you really intend these for the proof of your present *Roman-Churches Infallibility*, as that is distinct from all other *Churches of Christians* in the world? If you do (as you must, if you speak to the purpose) shew us what *miracles*, *efficacy*, *purity* and *excellency* of *Doctrine* there are in your *Church* beyond and beside all other *Churches* in the world, What *fulfilling of Prophecies* among you, which makes your *Church infallible*? Is it the *Prophecy*, That your *Church shall be infallible* that is fulfilled? Shew then to us where that *Prophecy* is, and how it appears to be fulfilled? Is it because your *Church* pretends to be *infallible*? I do heartily acknowledge, some *Prophecies* are therein fulfilled, but such as your *Church* hath little ground to be proud of their accomplishment. But, to all im-

S. 14.

partial *Christians*, the accomplishment of *those Prophecies*, which speak of the *degenerate state of the Church*, as they are a great Confirmation of the *Infallibility* of the *Divine Revealer* of them, when they see it so remarkably in the *signatures of your Church*; so they are far from being any *motive of credibility* to them to prove your *Church to be Infallible*. Unless it be meant that the *state of your Church is an infallible evidence that those Prophecies are fulfilled*. But I pray, why should *fulfilling of Prophecies*, make your *Church Infallible*? I had rather thought, if you could have proved your *Church to have been Prophetical*, it had been more to your purpose. And if your *Popes in Cathedra* had foretold *future events*, which by their coming to pass, had evidenced to the world they had a *true spirit of Prophecy*, then indeed you had said something towards *Infallibility*. But that the *meer fulfilling of Prophecies*, owned *Divine* by all *Christians*, should prove your *Church Infallible*, is such a *motive of Credibility* concerning that *Infallibility*, that it proves nothing, but by this consequence, *If Christ were Infallible, then your Church is*. Or do you mean, because some *Prophecies concerning your Church are fulfilled*, therefore your *Church is infallible*; by the same reason I hope you will not deny, but that *Antichrist is Infallible*, for when ever he did, doth, or shall appear, no doubt there will be *fulfilling of Prophecies*, and those very clear ones too. And therefore *Antichrist and your Pope* may go together for *Infallibility*.

But it may be yet you have some *other motives* besides *fulfilling Prophecies*, and those are *miracles*; now you speak indeed to the purpose. But yet still we poor *Infidels* (*because out of your Church*) desire a little satisfaction concerning them too. 1. We very reasonably desire, *That he in your Church who pretends most to infallibility, should do these miracles himself*. For that was always the way in *Scripture*, for them whose *testimony* was to be believed *Infallible*, to be the *workers* of those *miracles* which should induce Men to believe such an *Infallibility*. Do you think the *Israelites* would have believed *Moses Infallible*, if any ordinary *Israelite* had wrought those *miracles* which he did? unless you would suppose that those *miracles* were purposely wrought to have attested that *Moses was Infallible*. But yet God thought it much more fit, that *Moses himself* should be the *instrument* of doing them, and so it was with our *Blessed Saviour*. Let then your *Church* produce the several *miracles* wrought by your *Popes* to attest their *Infallibility*; or, if you believe *Pope and Council* the subject of *Infallibility*, produce the *miracles* to prove that. God was always so just and reasonable, as not to expect the belief of any *Infallibility* without such evidences given for it as might persuade Men to believe it: and you acknowledge, *That independently on Scripture there can be no such proof of Infallibility as Miracles*, and you require it from us to believe the *present Church Infallible*, where then are your *present miracles* wrought to attest this *Infallibility*? For as long as you require such an assent to the *present Churches Infallibility*, it is necessary on your own grounds, that the *present Church* should always work *miracles* in order to the proving this *Infallibility*.

2. We desire *such miracles as may sufficiently convince the Infidels as to this point of your Infallibility*. For that was always the way used in *Scripture*; The intention of *miracles* was to persuade those who did not believe. Would *Pharaoh*, or the *Ægyptians* have believed *Moses*, if all his *miracles* had been wrought in a corner, where none but *Israelites* had been present? Would the *Jews* have believed in *Christ*, if he had not come in publick among them, and wrought such frequent, publick and uncontroverted miracles, that his greatest enemies durst not deny them? If you would

would then have us believe your *present Churches Infallibility*, let your *Pope*, or at least your *Priests* come and do such kind of *Miracles* among us which may bear the examination of inquisitive Men, and then try whether we will not believe your *Infallibility*; but till then, excuse us. Think not we are of such easie Faith, that the pretended growing out of a *Leg* in *Spain*, or any of your famous *Miracles* wrought by your *Priests* in *Italy*, will persuade us to believe your *Church Infallible*. It is always observed; your *Miracles* are most talked on, where People are most ignorant, and therefore most apt to be deceived. Your *Priests*, like the *Devils* in the *Primitive Times*, can do no feats when their opposers are by; it is an easie thing for a *Stump* to grow a *Leg* in its passage from *Spain* hither; for *Fama crescit eundo*; such things are most believed where *Circumstances* are least capable of examination. And the *Juggings* and *Impostures* of your *Priests* have been so notorious in this kind, that their *Pretences* to *Miracles* have made more *Infidels* than *Catholicks*, by making Men more apt to question, whether ever there were any real *Miracles* done, than believe the truth of yours. Very likely then it is, that you should persuade the World your *Church is Infallible*, because of the *Miracles* wrought in it.

3. What discrimination do you put between those *lying wonders* which you are foretold shall be wrought at the coming of *Antichrist*, and those pretended *Miracles* which are wrought among you? Convince us by sufficient evidence, that the things which seem most confirmed by your *Miracles*, viz. *Invocation of Saints*, is a thing consonant to the *Doctrine* established by the undoubted *Miracles* of *Christ* and his *Apostles*? If it be contrary to it, either you must prove that *Doctrine* false; or, if you admit it true, you prove your *Miracles* to be false; because contrary to a *Doctrine* established by *Miracles* undoubtedly Divine. And God can never be supposed to attest with *Miracles* the Truth of *Doctrines* contrary to each other. And thence the wisest of your *Church* are so far from insisting on this of *Miracles* for a *Motive of Credibility* concerning your *Churches Infallibility*, that they leave it out from being a *Note* of the *Church*; because *Hereticks*, as they say, may as to all outward appearance work as great *Miracles* as the best *Catholicks*. And therefore *Bellarmino* saith, *No Man can have an absolute certainty concerning the truth of Miracles, because the Devil, though he cannot work true Miracles, can work, as to appearance, the greatest*. Therefore since the confirmation of *Christian Religion* by *Miracles* undoubtedly Divine, there can be no reliance on the tryal of *Miracles* for the truth of any *Doctrine*: For those very *Miracles* and *Doctrine* must be judged according to that rule of Faith which was confirmed by Divine *Miracles*. Thus we have examined those *Motives* which seem most to prove *Infallibility*, and shewn how little they agree to the *present Churches Infallibility*.

3. As to the other *Motives*, what evidence do you produce, That where-ever they are, the *Church is Infallible*; and, that these do infallibly belong to your *Church*? For both these must be made evident, or you do nothing. Now these *Motives* are, *Sanctity of Life*, *Succession*, *Unity*, *Antiquity*, and the very name of *Catholick*, &c. How hard is it to conceive the Connexion between these and *Infallibility*! Nay, they are so far from it, that it hath been abundantly proved against your Party, that these are no certain *Notes* of the true *Church* (which is a Controversie I shall not now discuss.) And if the *Church* cannot be proved to be true by them, much less certainly will it be proved to be *Infallible*. But suppose all this, is your *Church* so remarkable for *Sanctity of Life*, that it should be a motive for your *Infallibility*? Have your *Popes* been indeed such *Holy Men*, that we may not question

but they were moved by the Holy Ghost when they spake? Certainly, you have some other way to know it than all Histories both of Friends and Enemies, and the constant Fame of the World, which hath then much abused us with Stories quite of another nature. Or, is the state of your Church so pure and holy, that it must shew it self Infallible by that? But whom will you be judged by in this case? I desire you not to stand to the Verdict of your Adversaries. Will you believe Men of your own Communion? Pray read what sad Complaints are made of the degenerate State of your Church by Petrarch, Mantuan, Clemangis, Espencens, Erasmus, Cassander, and several others, and judge you whether we have not reason to cry up the Sanctity of your Church. But these, (it may be you will say) were discontented Persons. Will you believe then your Cardinals? And if ever you will believe them, it should certainly be, when they meet to advise concerning the State of your Church; and was not this the Expression of the Colledge of chosen Cardinals for Reformation of the Church, under Paul 3. *Per nos, inquit, per nos, nomen Christi blasphematur apud gentes.* Is not this a great evidence of your Sanctity? If you will not believe the Cardinals, you will not certainly question the judgment of him whom you would fain have to be Infallible, the Pope himself. And these are the words of Adrian 6. in his Instructions to his Legate at the Diet of Norimberg, A. D. 1522. *Scimus in hac Sede aliquot jam annis multa abominanda fuisse, abusus in Spirituibus, excessus in mandatis, & omnia denique in perversum mutata.* If ever Pope was Infallible he was in saying so, and he could not but be in Cathedra when he said it. You see then what evidence you have from your selves concerning that Sanctity of Life which is in your Church. But it may be still, you do not mean real Sanctity, but that the Doctrine of your Church tends more to promote it, than that of any other Church. I heartily wish, the quite contrary could not be too truly said of it, and it is well known, that one of your great Artifices whereby you perswade great Persons to your Religion, is, the liberty it indulgeth them in Sin here, and yet the hopes it gives them of Heaven hereafter. Our Doctrine requires indispensable Obedience to all the Precepts of Christ: Yours tell them, those which are the most strict and severe, are not Precepts, but Counsels of Perfection. * Ours, That there is no hope of Salvation without hearty amendment of Life: Yours, That Penance is requisite and external satisfaction to the Church; and for Internals, that Contrition is very commendable, but if there be not that, Attrition will serve the turn. Ours, Charges Men to look to their Salvation in this Life, because when Life is ended their Estate is irrecoverable: Yours, That though Men die in their Sins, yet they may be relieved by the Prayers of the Living, and that there is hope they may get through Purgatory to Heaven at last. So that supposing any Persons to own Christianity to be true, it is hard to conceive there should be more Artifices imagined to reconcile the Love of the Pleasures of Sin here with the hopes of Heaven at last, than are used by those of your Profession. So that if I should suppose my self a Heathen Philosopher, and any of your Profession should come and tell me, These were the Precepts, and these the Promises of Christian Religion, but I could believe none of them, but by the Infalible Proposition of your Church, and that I was to know your Church Infalible by that Sanctity of Life which was in it; when I had thoroughly considered, not only the Impieties committed by the great ones of your Religion, even in Rome in the first place, but the Artifices used to enervate all the Precepts of real Sanctity, and so plainly to see what Interest and Design is carried on under all these Disguises: I should be insuperably assaulted with the thoughts that those

those of your Religion who were the Authors of these things, were so far from believing your Church Infallible, that they really believed neither Christian nor any other Religion in the World. So much for that *Sanctity of Life* which is in your Church. As for your other Motives of *Unity, Succession, Antiquity, and the name of Catholick, &c.* they have so little affinity with any pretence of *Infallibility*, and do equally agree to those Churches, as the Greek and Abyssine, which you are so far from acknowledging Infallible, that you will not grant them to be true Churches (notwithstanding these Motives) that I cannot easily imagine to what end you produced them, unless to let us see; you had the gift of *saying something*, though *nothing* to the purpose.

When you have thus apparently failed in producing any shadow of proof for your Churches Infallibility by these Motives of Credibility, we now come to see how good you are at the defensive part, who have been so unhappy in your Attempts. Therefore we must consider what *Arts* you use in putting by the force of those Arguments which are produced against you by his Lordship. After he had urged that Question against you, *How it may appear that your Church is Infallibly governed by the Holy Ghost*, to which we have seen how impossible it is for you to give any satisfactory answer, he proceeds to another Argument, which lies in these words; *Besides, this is an inviolable ground of Reason, That the Principles of any Conclusion must be of more credit than the Conclusion it self. Therefore if the Articles of Faith, the Trinity, the Resurrection, and the Rest, be the Conclusions, and the Principles by which they are proved be only Ecclesiastical Tradition; it must needs follow, that the Tradition of the Church is more Infallible than the Articles of Faith, if the Faith which we have of the Articles should be finally resolved into the Veracity of the Churches Testimony.* To this your Answer is very considerable. 1. You tell us, *That the ground of all this Discourse is the Authority of Aristotle cited in the Margin, which you repeat after him.* But, I pray, Whence learn'd you that this was all the ground of his Discourse? For his Lordship doth not say, that Aristotle saith so, and therefore it is so; but says, *That it is an inviolable ground of Reason* (which words you prudently left out, that there might appear some Shadow for such a Cavil) and cites only the concurrent Testimony of Aristotle with that evidence of Reason which is in it. And will you deny this to be an undoubted Principle in Reason, that, *That which is assumed as the Ground and Reason why I assent to any thing, must be more certain and evident, than that to which I assent to on that Ground?* Certainly you must have an Art above all other Men to make the Superstructure stronger than the Foundation; the particular Problems in Mathematicks, more evident than the Postulata; the conclusion, surer than the Premises. But you think to come off this Absurdity. 2. By distinguishing between Science and Faith, or, as you express it, between the proceeding of the Understanding when it works naturally and necessarily, by and from the evidence and clearness of its Object: And when it works supernaturally, and produceth supernatural and free Acts, meerly, or at least principally from the Impulse and Inclination of the Will; for in such cases the Maxim holds not, viz. *That the Principles of a Conclusion must be of more credit than the Conclusion it self.* Now the Act of Believing is such an Act; that is, which the Understanding elicits, rather by a voluntary and free inclination and consent of the Will, than from any evident certainty in the Object whereto it assents. A most judicious and profound Discourse, to which I know not whether ever I can perswade my Will, but I am sure, I never shall my Understanding. Lest you should think, it is only some Impulse of my

§. 16.

P. 61. n. 3.
Aristot. 1.
Post. c. 2.
T. 16.

P. 57.

my Will which hinders my Assent, I shall fairly lay down the Reasons which keep me from it.

1. That all assent of the *Understanding* is grounded upon *Evidence*.

2. That however that *Evidence* proceeds, yet the *Foundation* of *Assent* must be more evident than the thing assented to. And these two I suppose will fully reach the Scope of your Answer, by shewing that your distinction of *Acts Natural and Supernatural*, is both untrue and impertinent.

1. That all Assent is grounded upon Evidence, i. e. that no Man can assent to any thing merely because he will, but there must be sufficient reason inducing and perswading to that Assent. You acknowledge this to be true in Acts of Knowledge, but not of Faith; but, What do you make to be the Genus in your definition of Faith? I suppose you will say, it is an Assent of the Mind. If it be so, the Mind cannot be supposed to elicit an Act of the same nature in so repugnant a manner to it self, that it should assent to any thing without evidence. I know what Discourses those of your Parry have, concerning the obscurity which is necessary to Faith. If you mean obscurity as to the Object believed, i. e. that the matters to be believed are not so clear to us as demonstrations, I will not gainsay it: But if you mean obscurity, or want of evidence, as to the reason inducing me to believe, I utterly deny any such obscurity to belong to Faith, or to be consistent with it. For God doth not require us to believe any thing without sufficient grounds for our believing it, and those grounds do bear a proportionable evidence to the nature of that assent which he requires. If he requires an *Infallible Assent*, he gives *Infallible Grounds*; if he requires a *firm and certain assent*, he gives *firm and certain grounds*; if he requires only a *probable assent*, he gives only *probable evidence*. But still, such as the nature of the assent is, such is the evidence he gives for it. To make this plainer by an Instance, That Christ was the true Messiah, he requires an assent built upon *infallible grounds*, and therefore God gave such *infallible evidence* of it by the Miracles which he wrought. That these Miracles were once really done, he requires our *firm Assent*, and therefore gives *certain evidence* by an Universal and uncontroled tradition; but whether St. Paul, or any other Apostolical Person were Author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, he requires only an assent built upon the most *probable grounds*, and therefore he hath given us no more for it. But still as the assent is, so the evidence must be. For Faith being an act of the mind, whose nature is to judge according to reason, we cannot suppose any act of it to proceed in a brutish manner by a meer impulse of the will. I deny not, but the will may be said to have some kind of influence upon the understanding, both in furthering and hindering assent: But it is not by any command it hath over the mind in its acts, but as it can divert the mind from, or incline it to the searching into the evidence of the things. Therefore when we commonly say, *Facile credimus quæ volumus*, and so on the contrary; it is not because of the will's immediate power upon the Understanding, but, as the desire of a thing makes us inquisitive after it, so the dislike of it makes us unwilling to hear the reasons for it, and ready to entertain any pretence against it. Thus, I grant, the will may have power upon the mind as to the eliciting the Act of Faith, not that I can assent to a thing as true, because I desire it to be true; but this inclination of the will removes those impediments which would obstruct my discovery of the evidence which is in it. You have certainly a mind of another mould than others have that can believe things which do not appear credible to you; yet such a kind of Faith as this, is very necessary for your Churches Infallibility; and for that, your discourse

of believing by the impulse of the will, is very proper and seasonable. But other persons may think it an *Imperfection* in their minds, that they cannot believe any thing any further than it appears *credible*; that is, that they can go no further than they have *legs*; nor see when their eyes are shut, or the room dark. But it may be, you will tell me, *All this discourse proceeds on supposition, that Faith were a natural act of the mind; but you speak of a supernatural Faith.* It may be so; but, I hope, you speak not of an *irrational Faith*, which must believe things beyond the evidence of their *Credibility*. Faith, whether *natural* or *supernatural*, *acquired* or *infused*, is still an *act* of the *mind*; and let it have but what belongs to it as such, and call it what you will. I deny not a peculiar *Operation* of *Grace*, in the eliciting the *Act* of *Divine Faith*; but still I say, The manner whereby it is wrought, must be agreeable to the *nature* of the *Understanding*, and by discovering the *Credibility* which is in the *Objects* of *Faith*. If you say, The *Assent* is *infused*, I must say, The *Evidence* is first *infused*; for as *Christ*, when he healed the *blind*, did not make them see *Objects* which did not appear *visible*; so neither doth the *Spirit of God* in planting *Faith* make Men discern *Objects* which do not appear *credible*; and the stronger the *Assent* is, the greater is the *Evidence* and *Credibility* of the *Object*. And can you call then that any *free inevident Assent*, which goes no further than the *Object* appears *credible*? It cannot be then any *Act of the Will*, but merely of the *Mind*, which yields assent to any *Object* propounded as *credible* to it. So that in what way and manner *Assent* is required in that same manner doth *God* give proportionable evidence: I deny not but that *Assent* is required to *Objects inevident* to *sense* and *reason*; but then I say, The *assent* is not required to what is *obscure* and *inevident*; but to what is *evident* to us, and therefore *credible*. In the *Incarnation of the Son of God*, the manner of the *Hypostatical Union* is to us *inevident*, but then *God* doth not require our *Assent* to the *Manner*, but to the *Truth* of the thing it self. Where-ever *God* requires us to believe any thing as *True*, he gives us *evidence* that it is so: where-ever it appears the thing is *inevident*, we may lawfully suspend our *Assent*, and, for all that I know, it is our duty so to do.

But yet you have not done with this profound discourse; For you very §. 17.
learnedly distinguish a double proceeding in probations; the one is, per prin-
cipia intrinseca, which you very well English (by intrinsecal Principles) Ibid.
i. e. such as have a necessary, natural connexion with the things proved, and
do manifest and lay open the objects themselves; the other is, per principia ex-
trinseca (by extrinsecal Principles) that is, such as have no natural or neces-
sary connexion with, nor do produce any such evident manifestation of the
things proved, but their efficacy, (viz. whereby they determine the under-
standing to assent) doth wholly depend on the worth and vertue of that exter-
nal Principle, whereby such probations are made. This you apply to Know-
ledge and Faith, that as Knowledge proceeds in the former way, so Faith doth
in the latter, which depends purely upon extrinsecal Principles, viz. the Au-
thority, Veracity, Goodness and Knowledge of God affirming it; which was
immediately known to the Prophets and Apostles, but mediately to us, which
however, must be infallibly conveyed to us, which can only be by the testimony
of the Church. This is the substance of your third Section; to which I
answer, 1. That all Certainty in the acts of the Mind, whether in Know-
ledge or Faith, must equally suppose the Truth of some extrinsecal Prin-
ciples, viz. the veracity and goodness of God: for otherwise we cannot cer-
tainly judge of those you call Principia intrinseca, to know what things
have

have necessary and natural connexion with the things proved. For, unless I suppose that God is so True and Good, as not to suffer Men to be deceived in the proper *actings* of my *Faculties*, I may judge such things to have connexions and dependencies one upon another, which really have nothing so. And therefore, so far your distinction concerning *Science and Faith*, will not hold. But, 2. If the meaning of this distinction be only this, That there is a different proceeding in a *demonstration*, from what there is in an *act of Faith*, I deny it not; but suppose it nothing to your purpose. For, tho' the *evidence* be discovered in a *different way*, yet there is in both proportionable *evidence* to the nature of the *Assent*. When I assent, because I know that the thing is true, the *evidence* of the thing it self, is the ground of that Assent; but, when I assent upon the Authority of any person, the *Credibility* of his *Testimony* is the *evidence* on which that Assent is grounded. Though this latter *evidence* be of another kind, yet it is sufficient for that *act* of the *mind*, which is built upon it; and that Testimony which I establish a firm Assent upon, must be as evident in its kind, i. e. of *Credibility*, as the *evidence* of a thing demonstrable in the nature of a *Demonstration*. 3. The main strength of your Answer seems to lie in this, That in such an Assent as is built upon Authority; as in the case of Faith, when we do not immediately hear God speaking, but it is conveyed to us by the Testimony of others, it is necessary that this Testimony be infallible. But, good Sir, this is not our present Question. Whether it be necessary that this Testimony be infallibly conveyed to us, but, supposing such an infallible Conveyance, Whether that infallible Testimony must not be more credible than the matters which are believed upon it? But, as though never any such thing had been started, You give us a long discourse of the different proceeding of Science and Faith, but never offer to apply it to the business in hand. I must therefore ingenuously commend you for an excellent Art of gliding insensibly away from a business you cannot answer, and casting out a great many words not to the purpose, that you may seem to touch the matter, when you are far enough from it.

And therefore I say, Secondly, That however the evidence proceeds in matters of Faith, yet whatever is the Foundation of Assent, must be more evident than the thing assented to. Especially where you suppose the Assent to be infallible, and the Testimony Infallible, which must ascertain it to us. This will be plainer by an instance. If I ask you, why you believe the Resurrection of the dead, your Answer is, because of the Authority of him that reveals it: The next Question then is, Why you believe that God hath revealed it; your Answer is, Because the Testimony of the Church is infallible which delivers it: Whereby it is plain, That though your first Answer be from God's Authority, yet the last resolution of your Faith, is, the Infallibility of your Churches Testimony; and that being the last resolution, that Infallibility must be the Principle on which the belief of the rest depends. For, according to your Principles, though God had revealed it, yet if this Revelation were not attested by the Infallible Testimony of your Church, we should not have sufficient ground to believe it. And if without that, we can have no sufficient ground to believe, then this Principle The Church is infallible, must be more credible than the Resurrection of the dead. Which was the Absurdity his Lordship charged upon you, and you are far from being able to quit your self of.

§ 18.

The next thing which you busie your self much in answering of, is, That according to these Principles of resolution of Faith, you make the Churches Testimony the formal Object of Faith, which you acknowledge your self to be a great

great Absurdity, and therefore make use of many shifts to avoid. I shall reduce the substance of your verbose, and immethodical Answer into as narrow a compass as I can, without defalking any thing of the strength of it. You tell us then, *That our Faith is resolved into God's Revelations, whether written, or unwritten, as its Formal Object, and our Infallible Assurance, that the things we believe as God's Revelations are revealed from him, is resolved into the Infallibility of the Churches Definitions, teaching us, that they are his Revelations; And that the Formal Cause of our Assent in Divine Faith, is God's Revelation delivered to the Church without writing; but because that is as it were at distance from us, it is approximated, or immediately applied to us by the infallible Declaration of the present Church. Hence it appears, our Faith rests only upon God's Revelation as its Formal Object, though the Churches Voice be a condition so necessary for its resting thereon, that it can never attain that Formal Object without it. And lastly, you tell us, The Churches Authority then being more known to us than the Scriptures, may well be some reason of our admitting them, yet the Scriptures still retain their prerogative above the Church: and thence you distinguish of the certainty of the Object and Subject; from all which you conclude, That the Churches Definition is not the Formal Object of Faith, but that our Faith relies upon it as an Infallible Witness both of the written and unwritten Word of God, which is the Formal Object.* This is the substance, in your long Answer, of what hath the face of reason and pertinency: Which I come to a close and particular examination of. And that you may not say, I pass over this important Controversie, without a through discussion of it; I shall first prove, that it necessarily follows from your Principles, *That the Churches Infallible Testimony must be the Formal Object of Faith.* And 2. That the Answers you give are far from being satisfactory that it is not.

1. *That it necessarily follows from your Principles, That the Churches Infallible Testimony must be the Formal Object of Faith.* In order to which, we must consider, what the scope and sign of this Discourse is, concerning the Resolution of Faith. The Question started by Mr. Fisher, in the Conference, was *How his Lordship knew Scripture to be Scripture, or, How the Divine Authority of the Scriptures was to be proved.* To this his Lordship returns a large Answer, to which you attempt a Reply in this Chapter, and mention this to be the main question, *How Scriptures may be known to be the Word of God.* To this, you tell us, *No satisfactory Answer can be given, but from the Infallible Testimony of the Church, and the great reason given by you in all your discourse, is this, That this is an Article to be believed with Divine Faith, and Divine Faith must be built on an Infallible Testimony.* The Question then resulting hence, is, *Whether on these Principles you do not make the Infallible Testimony of the Church, the Formal Object of Faith?* You deny, and we affirm it; but before I come to the particular Evidences of the Cause, some general *postulata* must be laid down, which by the very state of the Controversie, must be acknowledged by you, which are;

1. That the Question in dispute is not concerning the *Formal Object* of all things *divinely revealed*, but concerning the believing this to be a particular *Divine Revelation*. For, it is obvious to any one that considers, what vast difference there is between those two Questions, *Why you believe that to be True which God hath revealed;* the plain and easie resolution of this, is, into the *veracity and Infallibility of God*, in all his Revelations. But it is quite another Question, when I ask, *Why you believe this to have been a True Divine Revelation?* Or that such particular Books con-

T

tain

have necessary and natural connexion with the things proved. For, unless I suppose that God is so True and Good, as not to suffer Men to be deceived in the proper *actings* of my *Faculties*, I may judge such things to have connexions and dependencies one upon another, which really have nothing so. And therefore, so far your distinction concerning *Science and Faith*, will not hold. But, 2. If the meaning of this distinction be only this, That there is a different proceeding in a *demonstration*, from what there is in an *act of Faith*, I deny it not; but suppose it nothing to your purpose. For, tho' the *evidence* be discovered in a *different way*, yet there is in both proportionable *evidence* to the nature of the *Assent*. When I *assent*, because I know that the thing is true, the *evidence* of the thing itself, is the *ground* of that *Assent*; but, when I *assent* upon the *Authority* of any person, the *Credibility* of his *Testimony* is the *evidence* on which that *Assent* is grounded. Though this latter *evidence* be of another kind, yet it is sufficient for that *act* of the *mind*, which is built upon it; and that *Testimony* which I establish a firm *Assent* upon, must be as *evident* in its kind, *i. e.* of *Credibility*, as the *evidence* of a thing *demonstrable* in the nature of a *Demonstration*. 3. The main strength of your *Answer* seems to lie in this, *That in such an Assent as is built upon Authority; as in the case of Faith, when we do not immediately hear God speaking, but it is conveyed to us by the Testimony of others, it is necessary that this Testimony be infallible.* But, good Sir, this is not our present Question. Whether it be necessary that this *Testimony* be *infallibly conveyed* to us, but, supposing such an *infallible Conveyance*, Whether that *infallible Testimony* must not be more *credible* than the *matters* which are believed upon it? But, as though never any such thing had been started, You give us a long discourse of the *different proceeding of Science and Faith*, but never offer to apply it to the business in hand. I must therefore ingenuously commend you for an excellent Art of *gliding insensibly* away from a business you cannot answer, and casting out a great many words not to the purpose, that you may seem to touch the matter, when you are far enough from it.

And therefore I say, Secondly, *That however the evidence proceeds in matters of Faith, yet whatever is the Foundation of Assent, must be more evident than the thing assented to.* Especially where you suppose the *Assent* to be *infallible*, and the *Testimony Infallible*, which must ascertain it to us. This will be plainer by an instance. If I ask you, why you believe the *Resurrection of the dead*, your Answer is, because of the *Authority* of him that reveals it: The next Question then is, Why you believe that God hath revealed it; your Answer is, *Because the Testimony of the Church is infallible which delivers it*: Whereby it is plain, That though your first Answer be from *God's Authority*, yet the last resolution of your *Faith*, is, the *Infallibility of your Churches Testimony*; and that being the last resolution, that *Infallibility* must be the *Principle* on which the belief of the rest depends. For, according to your Principles, though God had revealed it, yet if this *Revelation* were not attested by the *Infallible Testimony* of your Church, we should not have sufficient ground to believe it. And if without that, we can have no sufficient ground to believe, then this Principle *The Church is infallible*, must be more *credible* than the *Resurrection of the dead*. Which was the Absurdity his Lordship charged upon you, and you are far from being able to quit your self of.

§ 18. The next thing which you busie your self much in answering of, is, *That according to these Principles of resolution of Faith, you make the Churches Testimony the formal Object of Faith, which you acknowledge your self to be a*

great

great Absurdity, and therefore make use of many shifts to avoid. I shall reduce the substance of your verbose, and immethodical Answer into as narrow a compass as I can, without defalking any thing of the strength of it. You tell us then, *That our Faith is resolved into God's Revelations, whether written, or unwritten, as its Formal Object, and our Infallible Assurance, that the things we believe as God's Revelations are revealed from him, is resolved into the Infallibility of the Churches Definitions, teaching us, that they are his Revelations; And that the Formal Cause of our Assent in Divine Faith, is God's Revelation delivered to the Church without writing; but because that is as it were at distance from us, it is approximated, or immediately applied to us by the infallible Declaration of the present Church. Hence it appears, our Faith rests only upon God's Revelation as its Formal Object, though the Churches Voice be a condition so necessary for its resting thereon, that it can never attain that Formal Object without it. And lastly, you tell us, The Churches Authority then being more known to us than the Scriptures, may well be some reason of our admitting them, yet the Scriptures still retain their prerogative above the Church: and thence you distinguish of the certainty of the Object and Subject; from all which you conclude, That the Churches Definition is not the Formal Object of Faith, but that our Faith relies upon it as an Infallible Witness both of the written and unwritten Word of God, which is the Formal Object.* This is the substance, in your long Answer, of what hath the face of reason and pertinency: Which I come to a close and particular examination of. And that you may not say, I pass over this important Controversie, without a through discussion of it; I shall first prove, that it necessarily follows from your Principles, That the Churches Infallible Testimony must be the Formal Object of Faith. And 2. That the Answers you give are far from being satisfactory that it is not.

1. *That it necessarily follows from your Principles, That the Churches Infallible Testimony must be the Formal Object of Faith.* In order to which, we must consider, what the scope and sign of this Discourse is, concerning the Resolution of Faith. The Question started by Mr. Fisher, in the Conference, was *How his Lordship knew Scripture to be Scripture, or, How the Divine Authority of the Scriptures was to be proved.* To this his Lordship returns a large Answer, to which you attempt a Reply in this Chapter, and mention this to be the main question, *How Scriptures may be known to be the Word of God.* To this, you tell us, *No satisfactory Answer can be given, but from the Infallible Testimony of the Church, and the great reason given by you in all your discourse, is this, That this is an Article to be believed with Divine Faith, and Divine Faith must be built on an Infallible Testimony.* The Question then resulting hence, is, *Whether on these Principles you do not make the Infallible Testimony of the Church, the Formal Object of Faith?* You deny, and we affirm it; but before I come to the particular Evidences of the Cause, some general *postulata* must be laid down, which by the very state of the Controversie, must be acknowledged by you, which are;

1. That the Question in dispute is not concerning the *Formal Object* of all things divinely revealed, but concerning the believing this to be a particular Divine Revelation. For, it is obvious to any one that considers, what vast difference there is between those two Questions, *Why you believe that to be True which God hath revealed;* the plain and easie resolution of this, is, into the *veracity and Infallibility of God, in all his Revelations.* But it is quite another Question, when I ask, *Why you believe this to have been a True Divine Revelation?* Or that such particular Books con-

T

tain

tain the Word of God. And it is apparent, by the whole process of the Dispute, that the Question is not concerning the *first*, but the *second* of these two.

2. That the Question is not concerning any *kind of persuasion*, as to this Divine Revelation, but concerning that which you call *Divine Faith*.

3. That this *Divine Faith must be resolved into some Testimony supposed infallible*. These three are things agreed on between both parties, as appears by the whole management of this Controversie. Only you suppose this *Infallible Testimony* to be the *Church*, which your Adversary denies, and saith, It will follow from thence, that you make your *Churches Testimony* the *Formal Object of Faith*, which I thus prove.

1. That which is the only *Ground and Foundation* whereon a *Divine Faith* is built, must be the *Formal Object of Faith*: but the *Infallible Testimony* of your *Church*, is the only *Foundation* whereon *Faith* is built. By the *Formal Object of Faith*, I suppose you and I mean the same thing, which is the *Foundation* whereon the *Certainty* of the *Assent* is grounded, or the principal *Objective Cause of Faith*, viz. not every account that may be given *Why Men believe*, but that which is the only *Certain Foundation* to establish a *Divine Faith* upon. Now, let any one but consider what the *Question* is, and what your resolution is, and then judge, Whether you make not the *Churches Testimony* the *Formal Object*. The *Question* is, How we know the *Scriptures* to be the *Word of God*; which in other terms is *What the ground is why I assent to the Doctrine contained in Scripture as a Divine Revelation*? You say, *The Testimony of the Scripture it self cannot be that ground*; You say, *The Testimony of the Spirit cannot be it*; You say, *A Moral Certainty cannot be it*, because then it is not *Divine Faith*: What then is the reason why you believe it? Do you not over and over say, *It is because of the infallible Testimony of the Church, which gives us unquestionable assurance that this was a Divine Revelation*; and yet for all this, this *Testimony* is not the *Formal Object* of this *Divine Faith*. The most charitable apprehension I can have of you, when you write things so inconsistent, is either that you understand not, or consider not what you write of, but take what hath been said in such cases by Men of your own party, and right or wrong that serves for an Answer. But for all this, you tell us confidently, *That your Faith is not resolved into the voice of the Church, as into its Formal Object; but it is enough to say, Our Faith is resolved into God's Revelations (whether written or unwritten) as its Formal Object: and our infallible assurance, that the things we believe are Divine Revelations, is resolved into the Infallibility of the Churches Definitions*. These are excellent Notions if they would hang together. But,

P. 58. n. 4.

1. We enquire not what is *enough to say* in such a case, but what *ground* you have for saying what you do. You have *enough to say* upon many subjects in this Book (or else your Book would never have swell'd to the bulk it hath) but you have generally very little reason for what you say.

2. Is that *infallible Assurance*, that the *things* we believe as *God's Revelations*, are revealed from him, a thing call'd *Faith* or no? If it be, as I hope you will not deny it, then by your own Confession, *Faith* is resolved into the *Churches Testimony* as its *Formal Object*; for, you say, This *Infallible Assurance* is resolved into the *Infallibility* of the *Churches Definitions*, teaching us, that they are his *Revelations*. These are your own words. And, do you yet deny this *Testimony* of the *Church* to be the *Formal Object* of this *Infallible Assurance*?

3. What

3. What is it you mean, when you say, That *Faith is resolved into God's Revelations as its Formal Object* ? Is it, that the reason why we believe, is, *Because God hath revealed these things to us* ? But that, you know, is not the matter at all in question, but, How we come to assent to such a *Doctrine as a Divine Revelation* ? Answer me punctually to it ; Can you possibly resolve your Faith into any thing else, as its *Formal Object* ? If you can, I pray do us the favour to name it. If you resolve this *Faith*, as you seem to express your mind, into *Divine Revelation*, as its *Formal Object* ; Shew us where that *Revelation* is extant, for which you believe *Scripture to be the Word of God*. Is it the *Scripture* it self, or a *Revelation* distinct from it ? If you say, It is the *Scripture* it self, then you must make the *Infallible Testimony* of your Church needless ; for then we may have *Infallible Assurance*, that the things we believe are *Divine Revelations*, without your Churches *Testimony* or *Definitions* : Then, what is become of the *unwritten Tradition* you mention in these words ? If then it be demanded, *Why we believe such Books as are contained in the Bible to be the Word of God* ; we answer, *Because it is a Divine unwritten Tradition, that they are his Word* ; and this *Divine Tradition is the Formal Object, whereon our Faith relies*. Well then, our last resolution of Faith is into this *Divine unwritten Tradition* : But whence come you to know, that this *Tradition is Divine* ? Into what *Revelation* is the belief of that finally resolved ? Doth it appear to be so by it self, and then why may not the *Scripture* ? Or hath it some other *Revelation*, and *Divine Tradition* to attest it ? And then the same Question returns concerning that, and so *in infinitum*, or else of necessity you must acknowledge one of these two things ; Either that some *Divine Revelation* may sufficiently manifest it self, without any *Infallible Testimony* of your Church : Or else, that this *Infallible Testimony* must be the *Formal Object of Faith*. Of these two, chuse which you please.

P. 59.

2. I prove that you must make the Churches *Testimony* the *Formal Object of Faith*, because either you must make it so, or you must deny *Divine Revelation* to be the *Formal Object of Faith* ; because the reason is equal for both. I demand then, How you resolve your *Belief of the Truth of the Doctrine of Christ* ? You tell me, into *Divine Revelation*, as its *Formal Object*. I ask yet further, Why you believe the *Revelation made by Christ to be Divine* ? Your Answer must be, either that your Churches *Testimony* gives you *Infallible Assurance* of it, and then the former Argument returns : Or else that *Christ manifested his Testimony to be Infallible*, and therefore his *Revelation Divine*, because of the *Motives of Credibility*, which accompanied his Preaching. If this be your Answer, as it must be by your former discourse, then by the same reason I prove your Churches *Testimony* to be the *Formal Object of Faith*, because you have endeavoured to prove the Churches *Infallibility* by the same *Motives of Credibility* that *Moses and Christ proved theirs*. Either therefore retract all your former Discourse, or else confess, that by the same reason that the *Divine Revelation* made by Christ, is the *Formal Object of Faith*, the *Infallible Testimony* of your Church must be so too. For according to your own supposition, there are *equal Motives of Credibility*, and therefore equal obligation to believe the *Infallibility* of one as of the other.

3. If the only reason which makes any thing to be the *Formal Object* agrees to the *Testimony* of your Church, then that *Testimony* must be the *Formal Object of Faith* to them that believe it. Now, that which is the only reason which makes any thing to be the *formal Object of Faith*, is the Supposition that it is *Infallible*. For, why do you resolve your Faith finally into

Divine Revelation? Is it not because you suppose God to be *Infallible* in all Revelations of himself ; and therefore if your Church be *Infallible*, as you say it is, by the same reason that must be the *formal Object of Faith* ; as if it were by the Revelation of God himself. But here you think to obviate this objection by some strange distinctions concerning your *Infallibility*. You tell us therefore, *The Churches Infallibility is not absolutely and simply Divine ; or that God speaks immediately by her Definitions : But only that she is supernaturally Infallible, by the assistance of the Holy Ghost preserving her from all Error, in defining any thing as a point of Christian Faith, that is, as a Truth revealed from God, which is not truly and really so revealed.* A rare Distinction this ! You say afterwards, *The Churches Definition is absolutely Infallible, but yet this Infallibility is not absolutely and simply Divine : I pray tell us, What is it then ? You say, It is Supernatural, but not Divine, and this Supernatural Infallibility, by the Assistance of the Holy Ghost securing from all Error, but yet not absolutely and precisely Divine : I pray tell us, What kind of Infallibility that was which the Apostles had in delivering the Doctrine of Christ was, that any more than such a Supernatural Infallibility as you fondly arrogate to your Church, viz. such a one as might secure them from all Error in defining any thing as a point of Christian Faith, which was not so, that is, as a Truth revealed from God, which was not truly and really so revealed. And yet, I suppose, you will not deny, but those who lived in the Apostles times, might resolve their Faith into that Infallibility which they had as its formal Object, and therefore why not as well into your Churches Infallibility, since you pretend to as great Infallibility in your Church as ever was in the Apostles.* Thus, I hope, I have shewn it impossible for you, not to make the Churches Testimony the Formal Object of Faith, since you make it infallible as you do.

2. We come now to consider, the little *Evasions and Distinctions*, whereby you hope to get out of this *Labyrinth*. But having so manifestly proved, that it follows from your Principles, That the Churches Testimony is the *formal Object of Faith*, all your distinctions fall of themselves ; for thereby it appears, that your Churches Testimony is not merely a *necessary Condition* of believing, but is the *formal Cause and Reason* of it, therefore your instance of *Approximation in natural Causes, is nothing to the purpose*. No more is that of a *Commonwealths practising the same Laws, being an Argument that those were its primitive Laws : Unless you suppose it impossible, 1. That a Commonwealth should ever alter its Laws. Or, 2. That it should practise contrary to its Primitive Laws. Or, 3. That it should be supernaturally Infallible in judging which are Primitive Laws, and which not ; without these Suppositions, I say, That Instance signifies nothing to the business in hand ; and when you have proved these true, I will give you a further Answer. Your Answer to *Aristotle's Text*, or rather to that *undoubted Maxim of Reason*, with which the Citation of *Aristotle* concurred, hath been considered already. Your Answer to the Testimony of *Canus*, is like the rest of your Discourse, trivial, and not to the purpose ; for *Canus* doth not only deny the Churches Testimony to be the *formal Object of Faith*, but the necessity of believing its Testimony to be *Infallible*.*

P. 62. *Non intelligitur necessarium, quod credo docenti Ecclesie tanquam testi infallibili*, are the very words of the Testimony cited in the Margin of his Lordship's Books.

Your next *Section* affords us some more words, but not one drachm more of Reason. For, How do you prove, that the Churches Authority is more known to us than the Scriptures ? Or, How can you make it appear, that

that there is any *Authority*, but what is *relative* to us, and therefore the distinction is in it self silly, of *Authority in se, & quoad nos*. For, whatever hath *Authority*, hath thereby a respect to *some* it hath its *Authority* over. And, can any thing be a ground of Faith *simply and in it self*, which is not so *towards us*? For the *Formal Object of Faith*, is that for whose sake we believe, and therefore, if *Divine Revelation* be, as you say, the *Formal Object of Faith*, then it must be more *known to us*, than the Testimony of the Church: For, that must be more *known to us*, which is the main cause of *Believing*. But, if all your meaning be, that we must first know what the *Church delivers for Scripture*, before we can judge whether it were *Divinely revealed* or no: I grant it to be true; but what is this to your *Infallibility*? Will you prove the *Infallibility of your Church* to be more *known to us*, than that of the *Scriptures*; and, on supposition that were true, can you then prove that the *Scriptures* should still retain their *Prerogative* above the *Church*? What your Authors distinguish concerning *objective and subjective Certainty*, pertains not to this place; for the worth and dignity of the *Scriptures*, may exceed that of *Tradition*, yet, when the knowledge of that wroth, relies on that *Tradition*, your esteem of the one, must be according to your esteem of the other. I will not here enquire, *Whether the adhesion of the Will, can exceed the clearness of the Understanding*; nor, *Whether Aristotle was unacquainted with subjective Certainty*; nor, *Whether our adhesion to Articles of Faith, be stronger than to any Principles evident to natural Reason*: For, I look upon all these Assertions to serve you in no other capacity, than as excursions from the matter in hand; and therefore I shall not gratifie you so far as particularly to examine them. For all then that hath been yet produced by you, his Lordship's Argument remains good, that, according to your Principles, *the Churches Testimony must be made the Formal Object of Faith*, and I am the more confirmed in it by the weakness of your Evasions; and, I hope, I have now made good those words which you challenge his Lordship for, *That it were no hard thing to prove it*.

The next Absurdity charged upon you by his Lordship, is, *That all the Authorities of Fathers, Councils, nay, of Scripture too, must be finally resolved into the Authority of the present Roman Church*: And, though they would seem to have us believe the *Fathers*, and the *Church of old*; yet they will not have us take their *Doctrine* from their own *Writings*, or the *Decrees of Councils*, because, as they say, we cannot know by reading them, what their meaning was, but from the *Infallible Testimony of the present Roman Church teaching by Tradition*. And this, he tells you, is the cunning of this Device. To which you answer; By what hath been said, it appears, *That there is no Device or* S. 19. P. 62.
Cunning at all, either in taking away any thing due to the *Fathers, Councils, or Scripture*; or in giving too much to the *Tradition of the present Church*. For we acknowledge all due respect to the *Fathers*, and as much (to speak modestly) as any of our *Adversaries Party*. But they must pardon us, if we prefer the general interpretation of the present Church, before the result of any *Man's particular Fancie*. As for *Scripture*, we ever extol it above the *Definitions of the Church*, yet affirm it to be in many places so obscure, that we cannot be certain of its true sense, without the help of a living, infallible Judge, to determine and declare it, which can be no other than the present Church. And what we say of *Scripture*, may, with proportion, be applied to ancient *General Councils*. For, though we willingly submit to them all, yet where they happen to be obscure in matters requiring *Determination*, we seek the assistance and direction of the same living Infallible P. 60, 61.

fallible Rule, viz. the Tradition, or the Sentence of the present Church. The Question is, Supposing your Churches Testimony to be Infallible, without which we can have no Assurance of what Fathers, Scriptures, and Councils say, What Authority remains among you, to any, or all of these? And it is not, what respect, you tell us, you give them; (for you may as easily speak, as believe contradictions) but what is really left to them, if your Opinion concerning the present Churches Infallibility be true. And he that cannot see the Cunning of this Device of resolving all into the Authority of the present Roman Church, will never understand the Interest of your Church; but, it seems, you apprehend it so much, as not to seem to do it, and have too much cunning to confess it. But, this must not be so easily passed over, this being one of the grand Artifices of your Church, to make a great noise with Fathers, Scriptures and Councils among those most, who understand them least, when your selves resolve them all into the present Churches Testimony. Which is first to gag them, and then bid them speak.

First, For the Fathers, you say, You acknowledge all due respect to them; but the Question is, What kind of respect that is which can be due to them, when, let them speak their minds never so plainly, and agree in what they please, and deliver what they will as the Judgment of the Church; yet all this can give us no Assurance at all on your Principles, unless your Church doth infallibly determine the same way. What then do the Fathers signifie with you? Doth the Infallibility of your Churches Definition depend on the consent of the Fathers? No, you tell us, She is supernaturally assisted by the Holy Ghost; and if so, I suppose the judgment of the Fathers is not that which she relies on. But, it may be, you will say, This supernatural Assistance directs the Church to that which was the judgment of the Fathers in all Ages. This were something indeed, if it could be proved: But then I would never read the Fathers, to know what their mind is, but ask your Church what they meant: And, though your Church delivers that as their sense, which is as opposite as may be, both to their words and judgments; yet this is part of the respect due to them, not to believe whatever they say themselves, but what your Church tells us they say. A most compendious way for interpreting Fathers, and making them sure not to speak any thing against your Church. Therefore I cannot but commend the Ingenuity of Cornelius Mussus, the Bishop of Bitonto, who speaks that out, which more wary Men are contented only to think. *Ego, ut ingenuè fatear, plus uni summo Pontifici crediderim in his quæ mysteria fidei tangunt, quàm mille Augustinis, Hieronymis, Gregoriis, That I may deal freely, saith he, I would sooner believe the Pope in Matters of Faith, than a thousand Augustines, Hieromes, and Gregories. Bravely said, and like a Man that did heartily believe the Pope's Infallibility!* And yet no more than every one will be forced to do that understands the Consequence of his own Principles.

And therefore Alphonsus à Castro was not to be blamed for preferring an Epistle of Anacletus (though counterfeit) because Pope, before Augustine, Hierome, or any other, however holy or learned. These Men understood themselves, and the Interest of their Church. And, al-

though the rest of them make finer Legs to the Fathers than these do; yet when they seem to cross their way, and entrench upon their Church, they find not much kinder entertainment for them. We may guess at the rest by two of them, Men of great Note in their several ways, the one for Controversies, the other for his Commentaries, viz. Bellarmine and Maldonate, and let us see, when occasion serves, how rudely they handle

In cap. 14.
ep. ad Rom.

Huic Anacleto soli magis crediderim, &c.
quàm Hieronymo, Augustino, aut cuius alii
recentiori, quantumlibet docto & sancto.
Advers. hæres. l. 6. verbo Episcopus.

handle the *Fathers*. If *S. Cyprian* speaks against Tradition, it was, saith *Bellarmino*, *In defence of his error, and therefore no wonder if he argued after the manner of erroneous persons*. If he opposeth *Stephen the Bishop of Rome*, in the business of *Rebaptization*; He seemeth, saith he, to have erred mortally in it. If *S. Ambrose* pronounce *Baptism in the name of Christ*, to be valid, without the naming other Persons in the Trinity; *Bellarmino* is not afraid to say, That, in his judgment, his Opinion is false. If *S. Chrysostom* saith, That it is better not to be present at the *Eucharist*, than to be present, and not receive it: I say (saith *Bellarmino*) That *Chrysostom*, as at other times went beyond his bounds in saying so. If *S. Augustine* expound a place of Scripture not to his mind, he tells him roundly, He did not thoroughly consider what he said. Do not these things argue that due respect they had for the *Fathers*? So long as they think they can make them serve their turns, then *Who but the Fathers*? If they appear refractory, and will not serve as *hewers of wood, and drawers of water* to them, then *Who are the Fathers*? it is the *Churches* judgment they rely on, and not the *Fathers*. And therefore they never want ways themselves of eluding all the Testimonies produced out of them: If they cannot say, those Testimonies are forged (as some of them say it, without any shew of reason, concerning that part of the Epistle of *Epiphanius*, about the tearing the veil, in which an Image was painted at *Anablatha*.) And as *Bellarmino* answers concerning the Author of the imperfect work on *Matthew*, because he saith, *There is no way to the finding Truth, but reading the Scriptures*; he therefore saith, This whole place was inserted by the *Arrians*; as though that had been any part of the Controversie between the *Arrians* and others. If *Origen*, or *Cyriel*, on *Leviticus*, saith, *It is necessary to follow the Scriptures*, then an Answer is ready. That these *Homilies* are of no great Authority: but if these will serve to defend the *Apocrypha*; if they speak of the *Obscurity of Scripture*; if they mention the *Observation of Lent*; if they speak of any thing tending to *Auricular Confession*, or *Penance*, then they are good and authentick enough. Thus the price of the *Fathers* rises and falls according to their Use, like *Slaves* in the market. If yet the *Fathers* seem to deliver their judgments peremptorily in a matter contrary to the present sense of their Church, then either they speak it in the heat of disputation, or, if not, they were contradicted by others as good as they; if many of them concur, yet it was but their private judgment, not the sense of the *Catholic Church* which they delivered. Still we see, the rate the *Fathers* stand at, is their agreement with the present *Roman Church*, if they differ from this, they were *Men* like others, and might be deceived, only the *Pope* is *Infallible*, or at least the present *Roman Church*. For, if *Hilary*, *Gregory Nyssen*, *Chrysostom*, *Cyriel*, *Augustine*, and others say, that *Christ*, when he said, *Upon this Rock will I build my Church*, understood *Peter's Confession* or himself, *Nihil magis alienum à sensu Christi cogitari potuit*, saith *Maldonate*, *Nothing could be more incongruous than what they say*. And in the next words tells us, *That all the Ancient Writers except Hilary, expounded, the gates of Hell one way, but he gives another sense of them*. The same liberty he takes in very many other places. By which we have a taste of that due respect which you owe to the *Fathers*, which is; *To value them, as far as they concur with your Church, and no more*; otherwise they are but the results of *Mens* particular fancies,

Respondeo, Cyprianum hoc scripsisse cum errorem suum tueri vellet, & ideo non mirum si errantium more tunc ratiocinaretur. De verbo Dei, l. 4. c. 11.

Videtur, mortaliter peccasse. De Pontif. R. l. 4. c. 7.

Hac Opinio falsa est, meo iudicio. De Pontif. l. 4. c. 12.

Dico, Chrysostomum ut quadam alia per excessum ita locutum esse. De Missa. l. 2. c. 10.

Respondeo, Augustinum non expendisse locum hunc diligenter. De Euch. l. 1. c. 11.

De verbo Dei. l. 4. c. 11.

Ibid.

Diff. D. 1.

l. c. 9.

l. 3. c. 1.

l. 4. c. 9.

De Penit. l.

3. c. 7. l. 4.

c. 9.

In Mat. 16. 18.

In Mat. 21.

In Mat. 19.

11.

In Joh. 6.

n. 69.

In Joh. 6.

n. 116.

and not to be compared with the *infallible Judgment* of your Church.
 S. 20. But, tho' it may not be so evident, that you give so great respect to the *Fathers*, yet it is notorious what reverence you shew to the *sacred Scriptures*: As for *Scripture* (say you) we ever extol it above the *Definitions* of the Church: What, ever! Do you think we have forgot the brave comparisons

Hermanus ait, Scripturas valere quantum fabulas Aesopi, si distituantur Ecclesiae auctoritate: referente Brentio. V. Bailly tract.

l. 9. c. 17.

Sunt Scripturae, quidam velut nasus cereus, qui se hoc sum, illorum, trahi, retrahi fingit: facile permittit. Albert. Pighius Hierarch. l. 3. c. 3.

Etiam si scriptura dicat, libros Prophetarum & Apostolorum esse divinos, tamen non credam esse, nisi prius hoc credidero Scripturam esse divinam: nam in Alcorano Mahometis passim legimus ipsum Alcoranum de caelo à Deo missum, & tamen ei non credimus. De verbo Dei, l. 4. c. 4.

Scriptura debet ab Ecclesia regulari, & non contra. Caranza Controv. 1.

Pigh. Controvers. l. 1. c. 2.

Valent. l. 4. c. 2. de Analyt. Fid.

Beilarm. l. 4. c. 12. de verbo Dei.

which have been made by your Writers, to shew the respect you bear to the *Scriptures*? Is it not much for the honour of the *Scriptures*, to be said to have *no more Authority than Aesops Fables, without the Testimony of the Church*? Did not those extol it above the Church, who call'd it, *A Nose of Wax*? and were not these some of you? Doth not *Bellarmino* profess his high esteem of the *Scriptures*, when he saith, *That the Scripture is no more to be believed, in saying It is from God than Mahomet's Alcoran, because that says so too*? Did not *Caranza* prefer the *Scripture* before the Church, when he said, *that the Scripture must be regulated by the Church, and not the Church by the Scripture*? I need not mention *Eckius* his *Evangelium nigrum* and *Theologia atramentaria*, *Pighius* his *plumbea Lesbia regula*,

Valentia his *Lapis Offensionis*, *Bellarmino's Commonitorium utile*, which, and many others, are remaining Testimonies of that monstrous esteem, which those of your party have of the *sacred Scriptures*. But, if the esteem you have of the *Scriptures* be so great, why lock you them up so carefully from the people in an unknown language? Is it, lest such *Jewels* should lose their lustre by too often using? Why are you so severe against your *Profelytes* reading them? Is it because you would not cast *Pearls before Swine*?

But still you extol the *Scripture* above the *Definitions* of the Church: How is that possible, when you tell us, *The only Authority it hath, is from the Churches Testimony*? For the *Authority* of it supposeth it to be acknowledged for a *Divine Revelation*, and that, you tell us, we can have no Assurance of, but from your *Churches Definition*: And we had thought, that which gave *Credit* and *Authority*, had been greater than that which received it. There can be then little reason to take your word in a case of this nature, when your very next words give so palpable a reason to the contrary. For you suppose the *Scripture* unable to express it self to any intent or purpose, unless your Church be the *Interpreter*. For the *Scripture*, say you, being in many places obscure, we cannot be certain of its true sense, without the help of a living and infallible Judge, to determine and declare it; which can be no other than the present Church. I answer, 1. Your meaning is not so plain, but that it wants the interpretation of your Church too. For what do you understand by the *Scriptures* being in many places obscure? Is it only, that there are some passages which have their *difficulties* in them? But what is this to the purpose, unless you could prove, that this *obscurity* is such as hinders it from being a *Rule of Faith and Manners*? If you prove that, you do something. The *Scripture* we acknowledge hath its *difficulties* in it, but not such as hinder the great design God intended it for; no more than the *macula* which are in the *Sun*, hinder it from giving light to the world; or some *crabbed pieces* in our *Laws* hinder them from being owned as the *Laws of the Land*. 2. Are those places obscure or no, which speak of the *Churches Infallibility*? at least such as you produce for it afterwards? This is evident, that there are no places whose sense is more controverted than theirs: Can these then be understood with-

out

out a *living and infallible Judge*, or no? If they may, so as we may be certain of their true sense, then why not all others which concern the *Rule of Faith* and manners, whose sense is far less disputed than of these? if not, then we must suppose a *living and infallible Judge*, before we know whether there is such a one or no: For that is the thing enquired after in the meaning of these places, and you say, We cannot be certain of their *sense* without him, so that we must first suppose the thing to be *true*, and then *prove it*; or else you run back again into your old *Labyrinth*. How know you that God hath promised, there shall be such an *infallible Judge*? By such places (say you) as you produce for it. Well, but the *Scripture* being in many places *obscure*, How shall I be certain this is the true sense of them? You say, because the *present Church* is the *living and infallible Judge* to determine and declare it. Do not you herein argue like a Man. that can *square Circles*? 3. In those places, whose *sense*, you say, is so *obscure*, where hath God made it necessary for us to have the certain *sense* of them? You can have no pretence for all this for an *infallible Judge*, unless you could make it evident, that God hath left no mysteries in his Word, but he hath left your *Church* a *Key* to unlock them; and therefore, I hope, there is a *Clavis Apocalyptica* too hanging at your *Churches Girdle*. It is true indeed, your *Church* is happily instrumental in explaining a *mystery* spoken of in *Scripture*, but not much for your comfort, it's a *mystery of Iniquity*. But in good earnest, do you think That God hath promised a *living and infallible Judge* to make us certain of the *sense* of *obscure places* in *Scripture*? Then two things will necessarily follow from thence. 1. That it must be necessary, that all those that believe this *infallible Judge* must know the certain *sense* of these *obscure places*. 2. That this *infallible Judge* must give the certain *sense* of these places. But then, Why hath your *present Church* so neglected her *Talent* this way, that she hath not decided all the *Controversies* concerning the *difficiliora loca*? Such a *Commentary* as this were worth inquiring after. But yet supposing your *Church* had done this, Could we be more certain of the *sense* of your *Church*, than we are now of the *Scriptures*? I will suppose your *Church* so charitable, as to put so useful a thing in writing, for the general good of the world: But all *Writings* (you tell us) are *obscure*, and want a *living Judge* to interpret them; and so consequently must that, and so in *infinitum*. But 4. All this while it is worth understanding, how you prefer the *Scripture* before the *Church*, when you make the *Church* the *living and infallible Judge*, to interpret the *Scriptures*. You make the *Scripture* a *dead Letter*, but your *Church* is a *living Judge*; you make the *sence* of *Scripture* *obscure, uncertain*, and therefore giving occasion to all the *errors* in the world, but your *Church* is *infallible*, to determine all *Controversies*, and yet for all this, you prefer the *Scripture* before the *Church*. It is plain, you do not, in regard of *evidence* and *certainty*; and one would have thought, these had been the greatest *Excellencies* of a *Rule of Faith*. Do you prefer it as such before your *Church*? If not, you deny it the peculiar *property* and *design* of it; and therefore whatever else you attribute to it, you are guilty of the highest disparagement of it. Just as if one should commend a *Mathematicians Square* for the *materials* of it, or the *Excellency* of the *Figures* engraven on it; but, in the mean time, tell him, It is *oblique, crooked, uncertain*, and he cannot draw a *straight line* by it: Do you think he would believe you commended his *Square*? Just so do you commend the *Scriptures*; and can you then imagine, that any rational Man will believe, that you do prefer the *Scriptures* before the *present Church*?

- S. 21. It is next to be considered, what respect remains due to general Councils, if the present Church be supposed infallible. For (say you) though you willingly submit to them all, yet where they happen to be obscure in matters requiring Determination, we seek the assistance and direction of the same living infallible Rule, viz. the Tradition, or the Sentence of the present Church. But 1. You say, You submit to them all: but, Do you submit to them all as infallible, or no? which you must of necessity do, or else apparently contradict your self (which yet is no novelty for you to do) for you spend a great deal of pains to prove general Councils infallible; and therefore I hope you own them as infallible your self. If you own them to be infallible, what need of the sentence of the present Church, as to those Decrees which you already acknowledge infallible? Or, do you really own them no further to be infallible, than as they agree with the sentence of the present Church? and then, I pray, What doth the pretended Infallibility of general Councils signify, if your Church give all the Authority to them? and what consents with your Church is infallible, and what doth not, is far from being so?
- P. 61. 2. You say, General Councils may happen to be obscure in matters requiring Determination; Do you mean, in things decreed by them, or not? If not, it is no wonder if they be obscure in matters they never meddle with, therefore, I suppose, you mean in things determined by them. Then I further ask, Whether these Decrees of general Councils, were the Sentence of the present Church, to those who lived in the time of those Councils? If they were, How could the Sentence of the present Church declare and determine the sense of what is obscure in Scripture, if, notwithstanding this Determination, the Sentence of the Church remains as obscure, as the sense of the Scripture? If it was not obscure then, but is so now, whence comes that obscurity? The Sentence of the Council is supposed to be written then, that those who were not present at it might understand the Decree of it; and it is supposed we have the very same Authentical Decrees of Councils, which they had who lived in the several Ages of them. How come they then to be more obscure to us, than they were to them? 3. What do you mean by matters requiring Determination? Is it not enough that things be infallibly determined once, but they must be determined over again? If the former Determination were infallible, what need any more? or doth the Infallibility cease as soon as the Church ceaseth to be the present Church, and then that which comes to be the present Church, must convey an Infallibility into it? but how comes any thing which was once infallible, to lose its Infallibility? which is a thing really so obscure, that your present Church would do well to help us out in it. But if, notwithstanding all your pretence of the Infallibility of general Councils, nothing is truly to be owned as such, but what agrees with the Sentence of the present Church, then we plainly see, what reverence you shew to all general Councils, even as much as the present Church will let you, and no more, which, supposing it never so great, is not shewed to the Councils, but to your Church. For, the reason of that Reverence cannot be resolved into the Councils, but into that Church for whose sake you reverence them. And thus it evidently appears, That the cunning of this device is wholly your own, and notwithstanding these miserable shifts, you do finally resolve all Authorities of the Fathers, Councils, and Scriptures, into the Authority of the present Roman Church; which was the thing to be proved.
- S. 22. The first Absurdity consequent from hence, which the Arch-Bishop chargeth your party with, is, That by this means they ascribe as great Authority (if not greater) to a part of the Catholick Church, as to the whole, which we believe in our Creed; and which is the Society of all Christians. And this is full of Absurdity

dity in nature, in reason, in all things, that any part should be of equal worth, power, credit, or authority with the whole. Here you deny the Consequence, which, you say, depends upon his Lordship's wilfully mistaken Notion of the Catholick Church; which he saith, Is the Church we believe in our Creed, and is the Society of all Christians; which (you call) a most desperate extension of the Church; because thereby (forsooth) it will appear, that a part is not so great as the whole, viz. that the Roman Church, in her full latitude, is but a piece or parcel of the Catholick Church believed in our Creed. Is this all the desperate Absurdity, which follows from his Lordship's Answer? I pray, shew it to have any thing tending to an Absurdity in it? And though you confidently tell us, That the Roman Church, taken as comprizing all Christians that are in her Communion, is the sole and whole Catholick Church; yet I will contentedly put the whole issue of the cause upon the proof of this one Proposition, that the Roman Church in its largest sense, is the sole and whole Catholick Church; or that the present Roman Church is a sound Member of the Catholick Church. Your evidence from Ecclesiastical History, is such as I fear not to follow you in; but, I beseech you, have a care of treading too near the Apostles heels: That any were accounted Catholics merely for their Communion with the Roman Church; or that any were condemned for Heresie or Schism purely for their dissent from it; prove it when you please, I shall be ready (God willing) to attend your Motions. But it is always your faculty, when a thing needs proving most, to tell us what you could have done: This, you say, You would have proved at large, if his Lordship had any more than supposed the contrary: But your Readers will think, that his Supposition, being grounded on such a Maxim of Reason, as that mentioned by him, it had been your present business to have proved it: But I commend your prudence in adjourning it; and, I suppose, you will do it, as the Court of Areopagus used to do hard causes, in diem longissimum. It is apparent, the Bishop speaks not of a part of the Church by representation of the whole, which is an objection no body but your self would here have fancied; and therefore your Instance of a Parliament is nothing to the purpose, unless you will suppose, that Councils in the Church do represent in such a manner as Parliaments in England do; and that their decision is obligatory in the same way as Acts of Parliament are: If you believe this to be good Doctrine, I will be content to take the Objecter's place, and make the Application.

The next Absurdity laid to your charge, is, as you sum it up, That in your Doctrine concerning the Infallibility of your Church, your proceeding is most unreasonable, in regard you will not have recourse to Texts of Scripture, exposition of Fathers, propriety of Language, conference of Places, Antecedents and Consequents, &c. but argue, that the Doctrine of the present Church of Rome, is true and Catholick, because she professeth it to be such, which, saith he, is to prove idem per idem. To this you answer, That as to all those helps you use them with much more candour than Protestants do: And, why so? Because of their manifold wrestings of Scriptures and Fathers. Let the handling the Controversies of this Book, be the evidence between us in this case, and any indifferent Reader be the Judge. You tell us, You use all these helps: But to what purpose do you use them? Do you by them prove the Infallibility of your Church? If not, the same Absurdity lies at your door still, of proving idem per idem. No, that you do not, you say: But how doth it appear? Thanks to these mute Persons, the good Motives of Credibility, which come in again at a dead lift, but do no more service than before. I pray, cure the Wounds they have received already, before you rally them again, or else, I assure you, what strength they have left, they will employ it against your selves.

You suppose, no doubt, your *Coleworts* good, you give them us so often over ; but I neither like proving nor eating *idem per idem*.

S. 23. But yet we have two Auxiliaries more in the Field, call'd *Instances*. The design of your first *Instance*, is, to shew, That if your Church be guilty of proving *idem per idem*, the Apostolical Church was so too. For you tell us, That a *Sectary* might, in the Apostles times, have argued against the Apostolical Church, by the very same method his Lordship here uses against the present Catholick Church:

P. 62, 63. For, if you ask the Christians then, Why they believe the whole Doctrine of the Apostles, to be the sole true Catholick Faith, their Answer is, because it is agreeable to the Doctrine of Christ. If you ask them, How they know it to be so, they will produce the words, sentences, and works of Christ, who taught it. But, if you ask a third time, By what means they are assured, that those Testimonies do indeed make for them or their cause, or are really the Testimonies and Doctrine of Christ, they will not then have recourse to those Testimonies or Doctrine, but their Answer is, They know it to be so, because the present Apostolick Church doth witness it. And so by consequence prove *idem per idem*. Thus the *Sectary*. I know not whether your faculty be better at framing Questions of Answers to them ; I am sure it is extraordinary at both. Is it not enough to be in a Circle your selves, but you must needs bring the Apostles into it too ? At least, if you may have the management of their Doctrine, you would do it. The short Answer to all this is, That the ground why the Christians did assent to the Apostles Doctrine, as true, was, because God gave sufficient evidence, that their Testimony was Infallible, in such things where such Infallibility was requisite. For you had told us before, That the Apostles did confirm their words with signs that followed, by which signs all their hearers were bound to submit themselves unto them, and to acknowledge their words for infallible Oracles of Truth. Was not here then sufficient ground for assent in the Primitive Christians, to the Apostles Doctrine ? Not as you weakly imagine, because the Doctrine of the Apostles was suitable to the Doctrine of Christ ; for the ground why they assented to the Doctrine of Christ, was, because of the Testimony of the Apostles. And therefore, to say, They believed the Doctrine of the Apostles, because it was agreeable to the Doctrine of Christ, and then that they believed the Doctrine of Christ, because it was suitable to the Testimony of the Apostles, is a Circle fit for none but your self, and that silly Person of your own moulding, whom you call the *Sectary*. It were worth considering too, How the works of Christ could prove the Doctrine of the Apostles suitable to his own. I had thought Christ's works had proved his own Testimony to be true, and not the Apostles Doctrine to be consonant to his : The works of Christ shew us the reason, why he was to be believed in what he delivered ; and did not the works of the Apostles do so too ? What need then any rational Person enquire further, why the Apostles Doctrine was to be believed ? Was it not on the same account that the Doctrine of Christ was to be believed ? But, say you, How should you know their Doctrine was the same ? What, do you want an infallible Testimony for this too ? Or, do you believe that God can contradict himself ; or that Christ should send such to deliver his Doctrine to the World, and attest it with Miracles who should falsifie and corrupt it ? Now, you will say, I am come over to you, and answer as you do, that the Apostles Testimony was to be believed, because of the pregnant and convincing Motives of Credibility. This, I grant ; but must be excused as to what follows, That these same Motives moved the Primitive Christians, and us, in our respective times, to believe the Church. Prove but that, and I yield the cause. But till then, I pray, give us leave to believe that still you prove *idem per idem* ; and your Answers are like your Proofs ; for this we have had

had often already, and have sufficiently examined before: As likewise your other *Coccyism* about the *Formal Object of Faith*, and certain *Inducements* to accept the *Churches Infallibility*; which I shall not think worth repeating, till you think what I have said against it before worth answering.

Your second Instance is, *ad hominem*; whereby you would prove, That P. 63. if he acknowledge the Church Infallible in Fundamentals, he must prove *idem per idem*, as much as you do. For (say you) if he be demanded a reason why he believes such Points as he calls Fundamental, his Answer is, because they are agreeable to the Doctrine of Christ. If he be asked, How he knows them to be so, he will, no doubt, produce the words, sentences and works of Christ, who taught the said Fundamental Points. But, if he be asked a third time, By what means he is assured, that these Testimonies do make for him, then he will not have recourse to the words themselves, i. e. to the Bible, but his final Answer will be, He knows them to be so, and that they do make for him, because the present Church doth infallibly witness so much from Tradition, and according to Tradition, which is (say you) to prove *idem per idem*, as much as we. Things are not always just as you would have them: If we allow you to make both Objections and Answers for us, no doubt you are guilty of no Absurdity so great, but we shall be equally guilty of it. But, it is the nature both of your Religion and Arguments not to be able to stand a Tryal: But however, they must undergo it. I say then, that granting the Church Infallible in the belief of Fundamentals, it doth not follow that we must prove *idem per idem*, as you do. For, when we ask you, Why you believe your Doctrine to be the *Sole Catholick Faith*, your final Answer is, because your Church is Infallible; which is answering by the very thing in question, for you have no other way to judge of the Catholick Faith, but by the Infallibility of your Church; but when you ask us, Why we believe such an Article to be Fundamental; as for Instance, That Christ will give Eternal Life to them that obey him, we answer, not because the Church, which is infallible in Fundamentals, delivers it to be so, which were answering *idem per idem*; but we appeal to that common reason which is in Mankind, Whether, if the Doctrine of Christ be true, this can be other than a Fundamental Article of it; it being that, without which the whole design of Christian Religion comes to nothing. Therefore you much mistake, when you think we resolve our Faith of Fundamentals into the Church as the infallible Witness of them; for, though the Church may be Infallible in the belief of all things Fundamental (for otherwise it were not a Church, if it did not believe them) it doth not thence necessarily follow, That the Church must infallibly witness what is Fundamental, and what not. It is sufficient that the Church doth deliver from the consent of universal Tradition, that infallible Rule of Faith (which, to be sure, contains all things Fundamental in it) though she never meddle with the deciding what Points are Fundamental, and what not. If you therefore ask me, Why I believe any Point supposed Fundamental, I answer, By all the evidence which assures me, that the Doctrine containing that Point, is of Divine Revelation; If you ask me, How I know that this Point is part of that Doctrine, I appeal to the common sense and reason of the World, as to things plainly Fundamental, and therefore by this means your third Question is prevented, How I know this to be the meaning of those words; for, I suppose, no one that can tell, that two and two make four, can question but if the Doctrine of Christ be true, the belief of it is necessary to Salvation, which is it we mean by Fundamental. Either therefore prove it necessary, that the Church must infallibly witness what is Fundamental, and what not; and that we must rely on such a Testimony in the belief of Fundamentals, or you prove nothing at all to your

your purpose, no more than your convincing *Motives of Credibility*; which, were they made into a *grand Sallad*, would know the way to the *Table*, they are served so often up : But I have found them so dry and insipid already, I have no encouragement to venture on them any more.

§. 24. But, still you are deservedly afraid we should not think worthily enough of your Churches Infallibility. You therefore tell us very wisely, that this Infallibility is not a thing that is not infallible ; For, say you, *Which*

P. 63. l. 50. *Infallibility must come from the Holy Ghost, and be more than humane or moral, and therefore must be truly supernatural, &c.* It is well you tell us of such a rare distinction of Infallibility ; for else, I assure you, we had never thought of it, viz. of an *Infallibility that may be deceived*, and an *Infallibility that cannot be deceived*, or, in your words, a *humane and moral Infallibility*, and a *supernatural divine Infallibility*. To ease you therefore of your fears, I solemnly promise you, that when I believe your *Church Infallible*, I will not believe it to have a *humane, moral Infallibility*, but *supernatural and Divine*. That is, when I believe her infallible, I believe her infallible. Your mind being eased of this grand fear, you think all the difficulty is over, and that you are out of any possibility of a *Circle* ; but I have endeavoured before to shew, you are not infallible in that : For the charge you exhibit against the *Bishop*, as though you had left him tumbling in the *Circle* you had so easily got out of ; I shall consider it in its due time and place ; but, if one may guess at being in a *Circle* by tumbling, you will not seem very free from it, who seem to be at very little ease by your impatience of being held to the *Subject* in hand.

Well, but yet our Conceptions must once more be rectified as to the nature of this Infallibility ; before our danger was least, we should have believed it to be only a *humane, moral, and not supernatural Infallibility*, and now we are bid have a care lest we think it to be any more, than in a sort, and in some manner divine. But, what kind of transcendental thing is this Infallibility ? It is not *humane*, nor yet *divine*, and yet it is *supernatural* ; which is scarce in some sort, or in a manner sense, How comes it to be *supernatural*, if it be not *divine* ? Or, is it *naturally supernatural*, and *humanely divine* ? It must not then be called *divine*, but, in a manner, and after a sort : But yet, (say you) so far as concerns precise Infallibility, or certain Connexion with Truth, it is so truly supernatural and certain, that in this respect it yields nothing to the Scripture it self. These are your own words : And if you did not believe Transubstantiation, I should think this the greatest non-sense in the world. But, What doth that *Infallibility* which is more than in a sort divine, import beyond what you assert doth belong to the Church ? Is that any more than precise Infallibility, and certain Connexion with Truth, and such as is in the Scripture, and all this your Church hath, and yet, when we say so, she drops a Courtesie, and cries, No, forsooth, though she be infallible, yet she desires to be excused, she is not infallible, but only, as if one should say in a manner, and after a sort, and so forth. Just as if one should ask a new married Woman, Whether she were certainly married to such a Man, and she should answer as to what concerns marrying, she was certainly married, but yet she was not absolutely married, but only in a manner, and after a sort. This is so great a mystery, you will oblige the World much to inform it a little more fully in these following Questions, What kind of *Infallibility* that is which is *supernatural*, and by the assistance of the *Holy Ghost*, which is equal to the Scripture it self in point of Certainty and Infallibility (your own words) and yet is not *divine*, but in a manner, and after a sort : And what way we should come to understand that manner and sort, and what degrees and sorts there are in *Infallibility* ? Whether any thing, so far as it is infallible, be not absolutely, as well as precisely infallible : And whether that which

which is but *in a sort divine*, be not *in a sort not divine*; Whether that which is *in a sort not divine*, be not likewise in the same *sort not infallible* (since all this Infallibility, by your own Confession, is from the *Holy Ghost*) and whether this be not an excellent way *in a manner*, and *after a sort*, to reconcile Contradictions. For, if a Man should ask you, Whether one might be, and not be, at the same time; you might easily tell him, That *absolutely and precisely* he cannot be, and not be; but *in a manner*, and *after a sort*, he maybe, and not be, together. You have cause therefore to make much of this distinction, and you never need fear baffling, as long as you carry it about with you; it is a most excellent preservative against all the *batteries of sense and reason*. But lest yet, for all this, we should apprehend something by this *in a manner*, and *after a sort*, as tho' they were some odd diminishing terms: You tell us, No; Catholic Divines, by this manner of speaking, do not intend to deny the Church to be equal even to Scripture it self in point of Certainty and Infallibility, What is now become of our manner and sort, when the Church dares justle with the Scripture for the upper hand, at least for an equal place as to Infallibility. What then is the intent of this distinction? It is to shew the prerogatives of Scripture above the Definitions of the Church. This doth well however to follow the rest, it comes so near to a contradiction, for if the Church be equal to Scripture in point of Certainty and Infallibility, what prerogative can be left to the Scripture above the Church? when that which makes it Scripture, and the Rule of Faith is only its Certainty and Infallibility? Yes, you tell us, The Scripture doth much exceed the Church in regard of its larger extent of Truth: because there not only every reason, but every word and tittle is matter of Faith; but in the Definitions of the Church, neither the arguments, reasons, nor words, are absolutely speaking matters of Faith, but only the thing declared to be such. Excellent good still, and all of a piece! I commend you, that you would not offer to mix any thing of sense in so good a discourse: For 1. How comes the Scripture to have a larger extent of Truth, than the Church, if we cannot know what Truth is in the Scripture, but from the Church? 2. How every word and tittle comes to be matter of Faith in Scripture, and not in the Church, when you say, The Church is equal to the Scripture in point of Certainty and Infallibility? 3. How any word and tittle can be any where a matter of Faith? I had thought, it had been the sense and thing understood by those words, had been matters of Faith; and then it is all one with the Scripture and Church; for you say, as to the Church, the thing declared is a matter of Faith? 4. What that thing is, which is declared by the Church, which is neither arguments, reasons nor words; and if it doth consist of these, how one can be believed, and not the other: Doth your Church declare things so nakedly, as to do it without arguments, reasons or words? That she can do it without words, it is hard to believe, but very easie that she can do it without arguments or reasons. 5. Are Men bound to believe what she so declares, without arguments and reasons too? If they be, shew whence that Obligation comes; and when you attempt that, you endeavour to shew some argument and reason why they should believe it. 6. What do you mean, that these arguments, reasons and words, are not absolutely speaking matters of Faith? it should seem then, that conditionally they may be so, and then shew the difference between them, and those in Scripture. 7. How is it possible for us to assent to any thing as a matter of Faith, if we do not first assent to the arguments, reasons and words, by which you would persuade us to believe the thing to be declared by the Church, and what is declared

Ibid.

Ibid.

declared by the Church is true. 8. Whether, when you say, *That in the Scripture every word and tittle is matter of Faith, at least implicitly, and necessarily to be believed by all that knew it to be a part of Scripture*; this will not equally hold as to the Church too, that every word and tittle, is matter of Faith, at least implicitly, to all that know it to be a part of the Churches Definition? And where then lies the prerogative of Scripture above the Church? Besides, you tell us, *The Church hath certain limits, and can define nothing, but what was either revealed before, or hath such connexion with it, as it may be rationally and logically deduced from it, as appertaining to the Declaration and Defence of that which was before revealed.* That herein you consult much for the honour of the Scripture above the Church, will appear when you have answered these *Queries*. 1. When the belief and sense of Scripture depend according to you, upon the Churches Testimony, Whether hath more limits, the Church or Scripture? For, whatever is in Scripture, must as to us have its Authority from the Church; and therefore your Church sets what bounds she pleases as to things revealed in Scripture. 2. Who shall be Judge, whether your Church define nothing but what was revealed before, when according to you, we can have no assurance as to any Divine Revelation, but from the Judgment of your Church? 3. When your Church defines things to be matters of Faith, which we think are not only not logically and rationally deduced from Scripture, but plainly repugnant to it, How can we believe that she doth not pretend to reveal something which was not revealed before? 4. Is that rational and logical deduction from Scripture sufficient to persuade any rational Man or no? If not, Why use you those terms; if it be, What need your Churches Definition, in a thing that is obvious to any ones reason? 5. Must we believe your Church absolutely, as to what is rationally and logically deduced from Scripture? If so, then, when she declares her own Infallibility, we must believe that to be rationally deduced, because she declares it. 6. Doth your Church make use of Logick and Reason in her deductions? then, Why may not every one else? unless she hath only the gift of Logick and Reason, which, I suppose, you will say, is but in a manner, and after a sort.

Moreover, say you, *The Church hath the receiving and interpreting Scripture for its end; and consequently is in that respect inferiour to it.* But, for whose end do you mean? the Churches, or the Scriptures end? If the latter; Shew us how any end of Scripture is attained by your Churches interpretation; if you mean the Churches end, I verily believe you, that your Church pretends to the receiving and interpreting Scripture for her own ends, and consequently, in that respect, she makes the Scripture inferiour to her.

P. 64.

Here again we meet with another piece of your Errantry, in attempting to vindicate your Doctrine from the enchantment of another contradiction. You say, *You hold it necessary, that we are to believe the Scriptures to be the Word of God upon divine Authority*; and yet, you tell us, *That the Churches Authority, on which we are to believe Scriptures is but in some sort, and after a manner Divine.* This seems to have a huge resemblance to a Contradiction; or else you must say, That it is not necessary that we believe the Scriptures on a simply Divine Authority, but only on such a one as is in some sort, and after a manner Divine: For, if you make the same Authority to be Divine absolutely in your pretence, and only after a sort in your Application, you reach not the thing you promised. If there be not, as you say, any necessity of defending the Churches Authority to be simply Divine, in answering that Question, *How we know Scripture to be Scripture,* then

then

then there can be no necessity of asserting, that we are bound to believe the *Scriptures to be the Word of God upon Divine Authority*? Which yet is your assertion before; but yet you would fain distinguish *between that which is absolutely infallible, and divine; the Churches Authority* (you say) *must be the former, but cannot be the latter*; when yet this Infallibility is, as you again tell us, *By the promised assistance of the Holy Ghost*. These are fit hedges to keep in *Cuckoms*, but none else.

But, as you are still off and on, sometimes seeming to go forward, and then stepping back again; sometimes answering, sometimes proving, which are great arguments of a disturbed mind, or a being in a *Labyrinth*, which you take many steps in, but can find no way out of, lest you should seem not sufficiently to contradict your self: You go about to prove, *That the Authority, teaching Scripture to be the Word of God, must be absolutely infallible*; If you prove that, I will undertake to prove it must be *simply Divine*: But, let us see however, how irrefragably you prove it. *And the immediate Reason, Why the Authority teaching Scripture to be the Word* §. 25.
of God, must be absolutely infallible, is, because it is an Article of Christian Faith, that all those Books which the Church hath defined for Canonical Scripture, are the Word of God; and seeing every Article of Faith must be revealed, or taught by Divine Authority, this also must be revealed, and consequently no Authority less than Divine, is sufficient to move us to believe it as an Article of Faith. P. 65. l. 8.
 But 1. Is it not possible for you to utter so many words without a contradiction? Were you not just before distinguishing that Authority which is *Divine*, from that which is *absolutely infallible*; and but in a manner, *and after a sort Divine*? And yet here, that Authority which you call *absolutely infallible*, in the former part of your Argument; in the last you explain it, *No Authority less than Divine*; Doth it not then follow, that an Authority *absolutely infallible*, is an Authority *no less than Divine*. But to let that pass among the rest of his Brethren, 2. Why take you this needless pains to prove that which you say before, *You and your Adversaries are agreed in*. 3. Supposing you should meet with some who should question this, as it is probable you may do before we part; I think it no difficult thing to answer this Argument of yours, which, in short, is, *Every Article of Faith must be believed upon Divine Authority, but that the Scriptures are the Word of God, is an Article of Faith*. To which I answer, If by an *Article of Faith*, you mean, that we must give an *undoubted assent* to, then I grant, that this is an *Article of Faith*, but deny, that every such Article must be believed upon *Divine Authority*; if by an *Article of Faith* you mean something to be believed upon *Divine Testimony*, then I grant, that every such Article must be built on *Divine Authority*, but shall desire you to prove, that that Faith whereby I believe *Scripture to be Scripture*, must be built on a *Divine Testimony*. For, I cannot see, how any, who say so, can free themselves from a *Circle*: and of all persons, you have the least reason to say so; for you deny the *Churches Testimony* to be properly *Divine*; and withal the Argument is very easily retorted upon your self. For, say you, *Whatsoever is an Article of Faith, must be believed on Divine Authority, but that the Church is infallible, I suppose, to you is an Article of Faith*: Name therefore what Divine Authority the belief of that is built upon? But, Do not you say, the belief of that is built on the *Motives of Credibility*, and, I suppose, you distinguish them from *Divine Authority*, or else they can do you no service for avoiding the *Circle*: Either therefore deny that *your Churches Infallibility is an Article of Faith*, or else deny it to be necessary, that *every Article of Faith, must be built on Divine Authority*,
 X rity,

rity, and then farewell your *old friends* the *Motives of Credibility*; or else, you see, how necessary it is for you, if you will vindicate your self from contradiction, to answer this Argument, and when you have done so, you will believe I did not much dread the force of it. The rest of that Paragraph, is a bare Repetition, the fourth or fifth time, of your Distinction about the *Formal Object of Faith*, and the *infallible Assurance* of it, which is a thing in it self so incongruous, and unreasonable, that I had thoughts mean enough of you, when I met with it first; but have much meaner, now I meet with it so often, for I see, as pitiful a shift as it is, you have no other to make use of on all occasions.

His Lordship goes on to prove that, since it is confessed between him and his Adversary, *That we must be able to prove the Scriptures to be the Word of God, by some Authority that is absolutely Divine*; this Authority cannot be that of the Church. For the Church consists of Men subject to error; and all the parts being liable to mistaking, and fallible, the whole cannot possibly be infallible in and of it self, and privileged from being deceived in some things or other. To this you answer, His Lordship's Argument (that the whole may err, because every part may err) is disproved by himself, because in Fundamentals he grants the whole Church cannot err, and yet that any particular Man may err even in those points. But, is it not plain, that his Lordship's design is to prove, that if all the parts are fallible, the Authority of the whole cannot be simply Divine? and therefore he saith himself, that in Fundamentals, in which the Universal Church cannot err, her Authority is not Divine, because the Church is tied to the use of means. You must therefore prove, that when every part is acknowledged fallible, the Authority of the whole in propounding any thing to be believed, can be infallible in and of it self: I cannot therefore understand, how the perfection of Infallibility in the proposition of any Object to be believed, can be applied to the whole Church, when every particular member of it in such a Proposition is supposed to be fallible. The Arch-Bishop therefore tells you, That there is special immediate Revelation requisite to the very least degree of Divine Authority; to avoid which, you would fain prove, that there may be absolute Infallibility, without Divine Authority, and immediate Assistance of the Holy Ghost, in delivering Objects of Faith, without immediate Revelation. You tell us therefore, Though the Church use means, yet she receives not her Infallibility from them, but from the Assistance of the Holy Ghost, which makes her Definitions truly infallible, though they be not new Revelations. But, How do you prove, that any thing but an immediate Divine Revelation can make such a Divine Testimony which is supposed necessary for the belief of Scripture to be Scripture? How can you make it appear, that there can be Infallibility in the Conclusion, where there was not Infallibility in judging of the Truth of the Premises? You say, By the Assistance of the Holy Ghost. But why should you not believe such an Assistance in the one, as well as the other? If therefore you assert, that the Spirit of God doth not assist infallibly in the use of the means, but only in the conclusion, then it must be an immediate Revelation; for what else it should be, is not intelligible. For, I had thought the Revelation had been immediate, when somewhat more was discovered than all use of means could attain to: therefore the Churches Infallibility must be a meer Enthusiasm. No, say you, Because it only declares what was formerly revealed. Though that be a Question among some of your selves; yet, supposing it to be so, it clears not the Business. For, suppose that God had supernaturally assisted the Understanding of any Prophet in declaring a Prophecy which had been revealed before, Would

not

not this have been as immediate a *Revelation* to that *Prophet*, as if it had been a *new Prophecy*? And the case is the same here; for, though you say, the *Material Objects of Faith* be revealed before; yet we cannot know the *Formal Object of Faith*, without your *Churches Declaration*, so that on your *Principles* there cannot lie an *Obligation to Faith* on us, without your *Churches Definition*; and therefore that is as necessary to us, as immediate *Revelation*; and to the *Church it self*, when you say, *The Infallibility proceeds so immediately from God, that if the Church should fall into error, that would be ascribed to God as much as in case of Divine Revelation*. What difference can you make between them? For, it is not, Whether the *Object* be new or old, which makes an *immediate Revelation*; but the *immediate Impression* of it on the *Understanding*. For if the *Spirit of God* doth immediately discover to any one, a thing knowable by natural causes, is it any thing the less an immediate *Divine Revelation*? So it must be in things already revealed, if the same things be discovered in an *immediate infallible manner* to the mind of any, the *Revelation* is as immediate as if they had never been revealed before.

Your last *Paragraph* affords us still more evidence of your *self-contradicting Faculty*; for which we need no more than lay your words together. Your words next before were, *If the Church should fall into error, it would be as much ascribed to God himself, as in case of immediate Divine Revelation*; but here you add; *Neither is it necessary for us to affirm, that the Definition of the Church, is God's immediate Revelation; as, if the Definition were false, God's Revelation must be also such: It is enough for us to averr, that God's Promise would be infringed, as truly it would in that Supposition*. From which we may learn very useful *Instructions*. 1. That *God's Promise* may be *infringed*, and yet *God's Revelation* not proved to be *false*: But whence came that *Promise*? Was it not a *Divine Revelation*? If it was undoubtedly such, Can such a *Promise* be *false*, and not *God's Revelation*? 2. That though if the *Church* err, *God* must be *fallible*, yet for all this, all *God's Revelations* may remain *infallible*. 3. That though the only ground of *Infallibility* be the *immediate Assistance of the Holy Ghost*, which gives as great an *Infallibility*, as ever was in *Prophets* and *Apostles*; yet we must not say, That such an *Infallibility* doth suppose an *immediate Revelation*. 4. That though *God's Veracity* would be destroyed, if the *Church* should define any thing for a point of *Catholick Faith*, which were not revealed from *God*, which are your next words; yet we are not to think, if her *Definition* be *false*, *God's Revelation* must be also such, which are your words foregoing. Those are excellent *Corollaries* to conclude so profound a *Discourse* with. And, if the *Bishop* (as you say) had little reason to accuse you for maintaining a *Party*; I am sure, I have less to admire you, for your seeking *Truth*; and whatever *Animosity* you are led by, I hope I have made it evident, you are led by very little *Reason*.

C H A P. VI.

Of the Infallibility of Tradition.

112:2:7
72D

Of the unwritten Word, and the necessary Ingredients of it. The Instances for it particularly examined and disproved. The Fathers Rule for examining Traditions. No unwritten Word the Foundation of Divine Faith. In what sense Faith may be said to be Divine. Of Tradition being known by its own Light, and the Canon of the Scripture. The Testimony of the Spirit, how far pertinent to this Controversie. Of the use of Reason in the Resolution of Faith. T. C.'s Dialogue answered, with another between himself and a Sceptick. A twofold Resolution of Faith into the Doctrine, and into the Books. Several Objections answered from the Supposition of a Child brought up without sight of Scripture. Christ no Ignoramus nor Impostor though the Church be not infallible. T. C.'s Blasphemy in saying otherwise. The Testimonies of Irenæus and St. Augustine examined and retorted. Of the nature of infallible Certainty, as to the Canon of Scripture; and whereon it is grounded. The Testimonies produced by his Lordship vindicated.

§. I.

YOU begin this Chapter with as much confidence, as if you had spoken nothing but Oracles in the foregoing, *Whether the Bishop or you were more hardly put to it, let any indifferent Reader judge: If he did, as you say, tread on the brink of a Circle; we have made it appear, notwithstanding all your Evasions, that you are left in the middle of it. The reason of his falling on the unwritten Word, is not his fear of stooping to the Church, to shew it him, and finally depend on her Authority; but to shew the unreasonableness of your Proceedings, who talk much of an unwritten Word, and are not able to prove any such thing. If he will not believe any unwritten Word, but what is shewn him deliver'd by the Prophets and Apostles, I think he hath a great deal of reason for such Incredulity, unless you could shew him some assurance of any unwritten Word, that did not come from the Apostles. Though he desired not to read unwritten Words in their Books, which is a wise Question you ask; yet he reasonably requested some certain evidence of what you pretend to be so, that he might not have so big a Faith as to swallow into his belief, that every thing which his Adversary says is the unwritten Word, is so indeed. If it be not your desire he should, we have the greater hopes of satisfaction from you; but if you crave the indifferent Reader's Patience, till he hear Reason from you, I am afraid his Patience will be tired before you come to it. But, whatever it is, it must be examined.*

Though your Discourse concerning this *unwritten Word*, be as the rest are, very confused and immethodical, yet I conceive the design and substance of it lies in these particulars, as will appear in the examination of them.

1. That there is an unwritten Word, which must be believed by us, containing such Doctrinal Traditions, as are warranted by the Church for Apostolical.

2. That the ground of believing this unwritten Word, is from the Infallibility of the Church, which defines it to be so.

3. That our belief of the Scriptures must be grounded on such an unwritten Word, which is warranted by the Church: Under each of these I shall examine faithfully what belongs to them in your indigested Discourse.

The

The first of these is taken from your own words ; where you tell us, *That our Ensurance in the main Principle of Faith concerning the Scriptures* p. 63. ch. being the Word of God, is Apostolical Tradition ; and well may it be so, for such Tradition declared by the Church, is the unwritten Word of God. And you after tell us, *That every Doctrine, which any particular Person may please to call Tradition, is not therefore to be received as God's unwritten Word, but such Doctrinal Traditions only, as are warranted to us by the Church for truly Apostolical, which are consequently God's unwritten Word.* So that these three things are necessary ingredients of this unwritten Word. 1. That it must be originally Apostolical, and not only so, but it must be of Divine Revelation to the Apostles too. For otherwise it cannot be God's Word at all, and therefore not his unwritten Word. I quarrel not at all with you for speaking of an unwritten Word, if you could prove it ; for it is evident to me, that God's Word is no more so, by being written or printed, than if it were not so : For the writing adds no Authority to the Word, but only is a more certain means of conveying it to us. It is therefore God's Word, as it proceeds from him ; and that which is now his written Word, was once his unwritten Word : But however, whatever is God's Word, must come from him, and since you derive the source of the unwritten Word from the Apostles, whatever you call an unwritten Word, you must be sure to derive its pedigree down from them. So that insisting of that point of time, when this was declared and owned for an unwritten Word, you must be able to shew, that it came from the Apostles, otherwise it cannot be owned as an Apostolical Tradition. 2. That what you call an unwritten Word, must be something Doctrinal ; so you call them your self Doctrinal Traditions, i. e. such as contain in them somewhat dogmatical or necessary to be believed by us : And thence it was, this Controversie rose from the Dispute concerning the sufficiency of the Scriptures, as a Rule of Faith, Whether that contained all God's Word, or all matters to be believed or no ; or, Whether there were not some Objects of Faith, which were never written, but conveyed by Tradition ? That what is thus Doctrinal, must be declared by the Church to be an Apostolical Tradition ; which you in terms assert.

According then to these Rules we come to examine the Evidences by you produced for such an unwritten Word. For which, you first produce several Instances out of St. Austin, of such things which were in his time judged to be such, i. e. Doctrinal Traditions derived from the Apostles, and have ever since been conserved and esteemed such in the whole Church of Christ. The first you instance in, is that we now treat of, *That Scripture is the Word of God* c. ep. fund. for which you propose the known place wherein he affirms he should not believe the Gospel, but for the Authority of the Church moving him thereto. s. 2. But this proves nothing to your purpose, unless you make it appear, that the Authority of the Church could not move him to believe the Gospel, unless that Authority be supposed to be an unwritten Word. For, I will suppose, that St. Austin, or any other rational Man might be sufficiently induced to believe the Gospel, on the account of the Churches Authority, not as delivering any Doctrinal Tradition in the nature of an unwritten Word, but as attesting that Universal Tradition, which had been among all Christians concerning it. Which universal Tradition is nothing else but a conveying down to us the judgment of Sense and Reason in the present case. For the Primitive Christians being best able to judge as to what Authentick Writings came from the Apostles, not by any unwritten Word, but by the use of all moral means, it cannot reasonably be supposed, that the successive Christians should imberzzle these Authentick Records, and substitute others

others in the place of them. When therefore *Manichæans* pretended the Authenticalness of some other Writings, besides those then owned by the Church, *St. Austin* did no more than any reasonable Man would do in the like case, *viz.* appeal to the *Universal Tradition* of the *Catholick Church*; upon the account of which, he says, He was induced to believe the Gospel it self, *i. e.* not so much the *Doctrine*, as the *Books* containing it. But of this more largely elsewhere. I can hardly excuse you from a Falsification of *St. Austin's* meaning, in the ensuing words, which you thus render: *If any clear Testimony were brought out of Scripture against the Church, he would neither believe the Scripture, nor the Church*; whereas it appears by the words cited in your own Margin, his meaning is only this, *If you can find, (saith he) something very plain in the Gospel concerning the Apostleship of Manichæus, you will thereby weaken the Authority of those Catholicks, who bid me, that I should not believe you; whose Authority being weakned, neither can I believe the Gospel, because, through them, I believed it.* Is here any thing like what you said, or at least would seem to have apprehended to be his meaning? Which is plainly this. *If against the consent of all those Copies which the Catholick Christians received, those Copies should be found truer, which have in them something of the Apostleship of Manichæus; this must needs weaken much the Authority of the Catholick Church in its Tradition, whom he adhered to against the Manichees; and their Authority being thus weakned, his Faith, as to the Scriptures delivered by them, must needs be much weakned too.* To give you an Instance of a like nature; The *Mahometans* pretend, that in the Scripture there was anciently express mention of their Prophet *Mahomet*, but that the *Christians*, out of hatred of their Religion, have erased all those places which spake of him: Suppose now, a *Christian* should say, If he should find in the Gospel express mention of *Mahomet's* being a Prophet, it would much weaken the Authority of the whole *Christian Church*; which being so weakned, it must of necessity weaken the Faith of all those who have believed our present Copies Authentick, upon the account of the *Christian Churches* Authority. Is not this plainly the case *St. Austin* speaks of; and, Is it any more than any Man's Reason will tell him? Not that the Churches Authority is to be relied on as judicially or infallibly, but as rationally, delivering such an *Universal Tradition* to us. And, might not *St. Austin*, on the same reason, *as well believe the Acts of the Apostles as the Gospel*, when they were both equally delivered by the same universal Tradition? What you have gained then to your purpose from these three Citations out of *St. Austin*, in your first Instance, I cannot easily imagine.

S. 3.
Tom. 2. ep.
114.

Your second Tradition is, That the Father is not begotten of any other Person. *St. Austin's* words are, *Sicut Patrem in illis libris nusquam Ingenitum legimus, & tamen dicendum esse defenditur.* We never read in the Scriptures, that the Father is unbegotten; and yet it is defended, that we must say so. And had they not good reason with them to say so, who believed that he was the Father by way of exclusion of such a kind of Generation as the *Eternal Son of God* is supposed to have? But, Must this be an Instance of a Doctrinal Tradition, containing some Object of Faith distinct from Scripture? Could any one, whoever believed the Doctrine of the *Trinity* as revealed in Scripture, believe or imagine any other; That though it be not in express terms set down in Scripture, yet no one that hath any conceptions of the Father, but this is implied in them. If it be therefore a Tradition, because it is not expressly in Scripture, Why may not *Trinity*, *Hypostasis*, *Person*, *Consubstantiality*, be all unwritten Traditions as well as this? You will say, Be-

cause,

cause, tho' the words be not there, yet the sense is : and I pray, take the same Answer for this of the *Fathers being unbegotten*.

Your third is, *Of the perpetual Virginity of the Virgin Mary* : This indeed, S. *Austin* saith is to be believed *sic integra*, but he saith not, *divina*, but, Do you therefore make this a *Doctrinal Tradition*, and an *unwritten Word* ? If you make it a *doctrinal Tradition*, you must shew us, what *Article of Faith* is contained in it. That it was not looked on as an *unwritten Word*, will appear by the disputations of those *Fathers*, who writ most eagerly about it, who make it their design to prove it out of *Scripture*. Those who did most zealously appear against the Opinion of *Helvidius*, were S. *Hierom*, and S. *Ambrose*, of the *Latin Church*. S. *Austin* only mentions it in the places by you cited : Of the *Greek Church* *Epiphanius*, and S. *Basil*. And yet every one of these contends to have it proved out of *Scripture*. S. *Hierom* enters his dispute against *Helvidius* upon those terms of confuting him out of *Scripture* ; and towards the conclusion of that discourse, see what a friend S. *Hierom* is to *doctrinal Traditions*. As, saith he, we deny not the things which are written, so we embrace not the things which are not written. We believe the *Incarnation*, because we read it ; we believe not the *Marriage of Mary after her delivery*, because we read it not. S. *Ambrose*, in his *Epistle to Theophilus and Anysius*, where he first mentions this Opinion, argues against it wholly from the *Testimony of Scripture* ; and the unreasonableness of the thing. To the same purpose *Epiphanius* discourseth of this subject, whose utmost Arguments are only probabilities ; Whether the *Antidicomariani* were the same with *Helvidians*, as S. *Austin* supposeth : Or, Whether they were the Disciples of *Apollinaris*, who broached the same Doctrine in the East, at the time *Helvidius* did in the West, as others suppose, is not material to our purpose, but this latter seems to be the Opinion of *Epiphanius* : Who in his *Epistle*, written in Confutation of that Opinion, chargeth the first Authors of it with great Ignorance of the *Scriptures*, and urgeth many places to prove the perpetual Virginity of the *Virgin Mary*, and therefore did not look on it as an *unwritten Word*. S. *Basil* in his discourse concerning the *Humane Generation of Christ*, falls upon this Subject, and goes about to prove it from the importance of *its*, which (saith he) although it seems to speak some circumscription of time, yet it really denotes to *always*, an indefinite time, as in that, I will be with you always to the end of the world. But he offers in this discourse with this remarkable Expression ; Although this be no hindrance to the Doctrine of Piety ; for till the *Oeconomy* of her delivery was accomplished, her Virginity was necessary ; but what became of it afterwards is not pertinent to this mystery : however, because the ears of those who love Christ, will hardly entertain this, that Mary ceased to be a Virgin, we suppose these proofs sufficient for it. Judge then whether S. *Basil* did believe this to be a Doctrine of Faith, or an unwritten word. This Testimony *Fronto Ducens*, is much troubled with, and would go about to prove this to be an Article of Faith, from the Councils of *Constantinople* and the *Lateran* ; in the first of which she is only called *ἀει παρθένα*. But doth that note it to be an Article of Faith ? As for his evasion of this Testimony, it is so impertinent, that I shall

Ipsa Scripturarum verba ponenda sunt ut ipsis quibus adversum nos usus est testimonis revineatur. Advers. Helv. prim.

Sed ut hac qua scripta sunt non negamus, ita ea qua non sunt scripta renuimus ; Natum Deum esse de Virgine credimus, quia legitur ; Mariam suscepisse post partum, non credimus quia non legitur. Hieron. advers. Helv. To. 2. p. 6. col. 1. ed. P. 1533.

V. Ambros. Tom. 3. ep. 9. Basil. 1555.

Epiphanius, haeres. 78. To. 1. l. 3. ed. Petav.

Aug. de haeres. 84.

V. Vasquez in 3. p. Thom. tom. 2. disp. 121. c. 6.

Epiph. haeres. 78. sect. 7. p. 1038.

Homil. 25. p. 509. Tom. 1.

Ἡμεῖς δ' εἰ καὶ κατὰ τὴν τῆς εὐσεβείας ἀπαγορεύουσαν λέγον (μήχει γὰρ τῆς κατὰ τὴν οἰκονομίαν ἀποστολῆς ἀναγκαῖα ἡ παρθένα, τὸ δὲ ἔφενης ἀπολυπραγματούμενον τῷ λόγῳ τῆς μυστικῆς καὶ ἀλείψουσης) οὕτως διὰ τὸ μὴ καταδέχεσθαι τὴν φιλοχρίσαν τὴν ἀκοήν, ὅτι ποτε ἐπαύσατο εἶ) παρθένα ἢ θεοτόκου, ἐκείνας ἡγούμεθα τῆς μαρτυρίας ἀντάγειν. Ibid.

Not. in Basil. Tom. 3. p. 49. ed. Par. 1638.

shall not repeat it, although he voucheth *Vasquez* for the Author of it. It cannot be denied, but that afterwards *S. Basil* produceth a Tradition for it concerning *Zachary's* placing the *Virgin Mary* after her delivery, among the *Virgins*, for which he was slain of the *Jews*, between the Temple and the Altar. But, we may guess at the credit of this Tradition, by what *S. Hierom* saith of it, that it came *ex Apocryphorum somniis*, and withal, gives a sufficient lash at all Traditions, by reason of this, in the next words. *Hoc quia de Scripturis non habet auctoritatem, eadem facilitate contemnitur, quâ probatur.* Which having no Authority from the Scriptures, it is as easily contemned as produced. And think you not then, that *S. Hierom* was a great friend to your doctrinal Traditions; and unwritten Word? But, say you still, *The Virginity of Mary must be an Article of Faith, because, those who denied it are called Hereticks; and S. Augustine calls Helvidius his Opinion, blasphemy.* But, though *Helvidius* be listed among the *Hereticks*, yet, I suppose, you will not say that all who are listed in those Catalogues are defined to be *Hereticks* by the *Catholick Church*? It is very apparent, that any one who seemed to broach any new fancies, and thereby disturbed the *Churches Peace*, were called *Hereticks* by them. And *Vasquez* confesseth that *Aquinas* calls it an *Error*, and not an *Heresie* in *Helvidius*. If it were so, he was not the first Author of it; for, *Tertullian* is not only cited by *Helvidius* for it, and *S. Hierom* casts away his Testimony, as of a Man out of the *Church*, but *Vasquez* confesseth he delivers it so often, that *Pamelius* could make no *antidote* for those places. One would therefore think, that one so near the *Apostles* as *Tertullian* was, might easily have learned such a Tradition, and so great a friend to *Virginity* as he was (while a *Montanist*) should not have been apt to believe the contrary. That which was accounted *Blasphemy* in *Helvidius*, was the rashness of his assertion, which seemed dishonourable to the *Blessed Virgin*, and not as though he did thereby overthrow any Article of Faith. For the other part of your Tradition, that she was a *Virgin* in the Birth of *Christ*, you will find it a greater difficulty to make it out to have been believed as a *Tradition*, much less as an unwritten Word. For not only *Tertullian*, but *Ignatius*, *Irenæus*, *Origen*, *Epiphanius*, *Ambrose*, *Theophylact* oppose you in it; and judge you then, whether this were owned as a constant Tradition or no. But it is not worth while to insist upon it.

§. 4. Your fourth Instance is, concerning the *Rebaptization of Hereticks*. Concerning which, two things are to be considered, *The Custom it self*, and the *Right and Law* on which that Custom was grounded. In the places by you cited out of *S. Austin*, it is plain, he speaks of the Custom, and Practice of the *Church*, which (saith he) did not use the *Iteration of Baptism*, which Custom, he believed, did come from *Apostolical Tradition*; as many other things which are not found in the writings of the *Apostles*, nor in following Councils, yet because they are observed by the *Universal Church*, are believed to be delivered, and commended by them. To the same purpose is the other Testimony. But what is this to doctrinal Traditions, concerning matters of Faith? That there were many *Ecclesiastical Customs* observed in the *Church* as *Apostolical Traditions*, I deny not, but that is not our present Question. If you therefore enquire into that which is only doctrinal in this case concerning the right and lawfulness of Practice in this case, that he fixeth wholly upon the Scriptures. The Practice of the *Church* in admitting *Hereticks* without baptizing them again, might be known by Tradition, but whether the *Church* did well or ill in it, must be by

S. Austin's

Comment,
in Matth.
23. Tom. 9.

Ubi supra.

In 3. p. Tho.
tom. 2. q.
28. art. 3.
cap. 7.

Contra Do-
natist. l. 2.
c. 7.

S. *Augustine's* own confession determined out of *Scripture*. And in that latter place by you cited, there is mentioned no such thing as an unwritten word, or that the *Apostles* had left any command that *Hereticks* should not be baptized again. *Nilil quidem exinde præceperunt Apostoli*, are his own words: there being then neither written nor unwritten Word for it, S. *Augustine* takes the likeliest course he could think of, which was, from the Custom of the Church, to judge most probably what was most agreeable to the *Apostles* minds. But still, when he comes to urge most home against the *Donatists*, he makes his recourse to the *Scriptures*. And offers to prove the matter in dispute from them, and would have all tryed by the Balance of the Lord. And expressly saith, It is against the *Lords* command, that those who have had lawful Baptism already, should be rebaptized. So that we see, S. *Augustine* did not himself think it a sufficient proof of *Apostolical Tradition*, that it was a Custom of the Church, unless he did likewise produce certain evidence out of *Scripture* for the confirmation of it. Neither then will your fourth Instance prove what it was brought for.

Ex Evangelio profero certa documenta. l. i. c. Donatist. cap. 6.

Quid sit perniciosus, utrum non baptizari an rebaptizari, judicare difficile est, verumtamen recurrens ad illam statutam Doctrinam, ubi

non ex humano sensu sed ex divinâ auctoritate rerum momenta pensantur, invenio de utraque re Domini sententiam, nempe in *Scripturis*. l. 2. c. 14. Huc accedit quia bene perspectis ex utroque latere disputationis rationibus, & *Scripturarum* Testimonio, potest etiam dici, Quod veritas declaravit hoc sequimur. l. 4. c. 7. vid. l. 4. c. 24. l. 5. c. 4. l. 6. c. 1. l. 5. c. 23. c. 26.

Your fifth concerning *Infants Baptism*, you have given us occasion to consider largely already; your sixth depends upon that; your seventh is only a rite of the Church. To your eighth I answer, Tho' the Tradition of the Church be a great confirmation of the *Apostolical Practice* in observation of the *Lords* day, yet that very Practice, and the ground of it, are sufficiently deduced from *Scripture*. Among all these Instances therefore, we are yet to seek for such a doctrinal Tradition, as makes an unwritten Word. But, methinks an Author, who would seem so much versed in S. *Augustine*, might, among all these Instances, have found out one more, which would have looked more like a doctrinal Tradition, than most of these, which is, the necessity of the Eucharist to baptized Infants: The places are so many, and so express in him concerning it, that it would be a needless task to produce them. I shall only therefore refer you to your *Espen-*

Esper. de Eucharist. ad Orat. l. 2. c. 12.

caus, who hath made some collection of them. When you have viewed them, I pray bethink your self of some convenient Answer to them, which either must be by asserting, that S. *Augustine* might be deceived in judging of *Doctrinal* and *Apostolical Traditions*; and then to what purpose are your eight Instances out of him? Or else that might be accounted an *Apostolical Tradition* in one age, which may not in another; and then, since, according to your judgment, the present Church is infallible in every age, that was infallibly an *Apostolical Tradition* in one age, which infallibly is not so in another. Which leaves us in a greater dispute than ever, what these *Apostolical Traditions* are, when the Church in several ages doth so much differ concerning them.

S. 5.

After you have, in your way, attempted to prove such unwritten Words, or doctrinal Traditions, you fall upon a high charge against his Lordship, and not without a severe reflection on all Protestants, in these words. It is so natural to Protestants to build upon false grounds, that they cannot enter into a Question, without supposing a falshood; so his Lordship here feeds his humour, and obtrudes many. It is well yet his Lordship meets with no worse entertainment than all Protestants do: You think all Protestants still build upon false grounds, because not supra hanc Petram, and that they still suppose falshoods, because they suppose your Church fallible, whether she under-

P. 68.

takes to explain written, or define unwritten Words. But, whether his Lordship feeds his humour in obtruding falsehoods, or you yours in calumniating, will appear upon examination. You say, *He makes Bellarmine, and all Catholick Doctors, maintain, that whatever they please to call Tradition, must presently be received by all as God's unwritten Word.* Upon which you go about to vindicate *Bellarmino*, by repeating his distinctions concerning Traditions, viz. *That some are Divine, others Apostolical, and others Ecclesiastical, and that some belong to Faith, others to Manners.* But all this doth not serve your turn. For 1. His Lordship doth not deny, that *Bellarmino* useth these distinctions, but reduceth all these several Traditions under the same common title *de Verbo Dei non scripto*; and that his design therein, is to impose upon unwary Readers, that all the Traditions mentioned by him, are *God's unwritten Word*. Upon which, his Lordship had good reason to go about to undeceive them, and to make it appear so evidently as he hath done, that *Tradition*, and *God's unwritten Word*, are not convertible terms; both because there may be justly supposed to have been many *unwritten Words*, which were never delivered over to the Church; and that there are many things which go for Traditions in your Church, which have no shadow of pretence from an *unwritten Word*. 2. There may be yet further cunning in all this; for although *Bellarmino* and you distinguish of Traditions, *Divine, Apostolical and Ecclesiastical*; yet when you come to put the difference between these, I suppose you would not leave it to every particular person, to judge which of these Traditions is of these several natures, but the Church must be judge of them. So that a Tradition is *Ecclesiastical*, when your Church will have it so, that is, when it is disused among you, as the *three dippings in Baptism*, the *participation of Eucharists by Infants*, &c. But when any Tradition is still in use by your Church, then your Churches Practice being in this case a sufficient Definition as to all those things so used by your Church, they must be accounted *Apostolical*, if not *Divine*. 3. Of what kind or nature soever these Traditions are supposed to be, whether *Divine, Apostolical, or Ecclesiastical*, prove any of them to contain any thing necessary for Faith and Salvation, and you will then come near an *unwritten Word*. Your *Ecclesiastical Traditions* discard your self from being such, inform us then what *Divine and Apostolical Traditions* those are which are founded on such an *unwritten Word*? Whether any of your *Ecclesiastical Traditions* contradict *God's Word*, or no, is not here a place to examine; we are now enquiring, whether there be any such thing as an *unwritten Word* at all, which contains any matter necessary for us to believe, or practise. The only pretence you have here for it, is, *That we believe by Divine Faith, that Scripture is God's Word, and that there is no other Word of God to assure us of this Point, but the Tradition delivered to us by the Church, and that such Tradition so delivered, must be the unwritten Word of God.* How far we are to believe Scriptures to be the Word of God, with *Divine Faith*, will be thoroughly examined in its due time; and likewise how far any Word of God is necessary for the Foundation of this Faith: only I cannot here but take notice, what it is which makes a Tradition be the *unwritten Word of God*; and what becomes then of your former distinction concerning Traditions? for we see, that which makes them the Word of God, is their being delivered by the Church; so that let their Author, Nature, or Matter be what it will, according to this Principle any Tradition being delivered by your Church, becomes an *unwritten Word*. So I come to the second Proposition,

2. That

2. That the ground of believing any unwritten Word, is the Infallibility of your Church defining it to be so. For you say, As the Church was Infallible in defining what was written, so is she also Infallible in defining what was not written. And so she came neither *traderet non traditum*, nor can she be unfaithful to God, in not faithfully keeping the depositum committed to her trust: Neither can her Sons ever justly accuse her of the contrary, but are bound to believe her Tradition, because she being Infallible, the Tradition she delivers can never be against the Word of their Father. The substance of all which, is that which I laid down as your Proposition, That the ground of believing any Tradition to be Apostolical, or any unwritten Word, is your Churches Infallibility in defining it to be so. Which being built on a Principle, I have already manifested to be so fallacious and uncertain, I might without further trouble, quit my hands of it: But I shall, however, shew how inconsistent this is with the Rules of the Ancients, for discerning when Traditions are Apostolical, and when not. The great Rule we meet with among the Ancients for judging Apostolical Traditions, is that of *Vincentius Lirinensis*, *In ipsa item Catholica Ecclesia magnopere curandum est, ut id teneamus, quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus creditum est: hoc est enim verè proprièque Catholicum.* If this be a certain Rule to judge of Catholick and Apostolical Traditions by, viz. That which hath been held every where, always, and by all; then the judgment of your Church cannot be the infallible definer of Apostolical Traditions, unless you will suppose that your Church only can tell us, what was held every where, always, and by all: And if your Church alone can infallibly determine what Traditions are Apostolical, to what purpose should we be put to such a *Wild-goose chase*, to enquire *Universality*, *Antiquity* and *Consent* in all things which pretend to be Traditions? But to any reasonable Man, as to any thing which pretends to be a matter necessary to be believed or practised, which is not expressly revealed in Scripture; this Rule of *Vincentius* seems very just and equitable, that before we believe it necessary, it be made appear, that it was universally believed by Christians to be so, and that in all Ages. And I assure you, I am so far convinced of the reasonableness of this Proposal, that if you will make out any of those things controverted between us, such as *Invocation of Saints*, *Worship of Images*, *Transubstantiation*, *Adoration of the Eucharist*, *Purgatory*, *Indulgences*, the *Pope's Supremacy*, &c. by these Rules, and make it appear to me, that these were held by all Christian Churches, at all times, or have *Antiquity*, *Universality*, and *Consent*; I shall be very inclinable to embrace what your Church would impose upon me. But when I know how impossible a task this is, I do not at all wonder that you should quit this formerly magnified saying of *Vincentius*, and resolve all into the Infallibility of the present Church. But hereby we see, how far you are from the judgment of *Antiquity*, as to this very point of the tryal of doctrinal Traditions, since you can see no security any where but in your selves, and your Churches Infallibility; I will therefore reduce the Controversie yet shorter: Prove but this Infallibility of your Church in defining the written and underwritten Word by these Rules of *Vincentius*, *Universality*, *Antiquity* and *Consent*, and I will yield you all the rest. But what unreasonable Men are you, if you must be Parties and Judges too; or if we must believe an unwritten Word, because your Church is Infallible; and believe your Church Infallible, because that is an unwritten Word? And well may you call it so; for, search the whole Book of Scriptures, and all the Records of the Primitive Church, and you find nothing at all of it. We see plainly then, you are resolved to be tried by none but your selves, and

so you are *Catholicks*, because you say, You are so ; and, your *Church Infallible*, because she pretends to be so.

- §. 7. 3. That our belief of the *Scriptures* must be resolved into an *unwritten Word*, which is defined by your *Church* to be such: This is that, for whose sake all your other discourse is brought in, and is the main thing to the purpose, Although you pretend likewise to a power in your *Church*, to declare what *Christ* said when he held his peace. (But, are you sure your *Church* will be infallible in that too?) For when his *Lordship* had said, *That where-ever Christ held his peace, and that his words are not registred, no Man may dare without rashness, to say, They were these or these*: You very gravely add, *That his Lordship must give you leave to tell him, you must bind up his whole assertion with this Proviso, but according as the Church shall declare.* Your *Church* then must declare when *Christ* held his peace, and when he did not ; when he spake so, that others might hear him, and when he did not ; when any thing was taken notice of that he said, and when not. But when it is apparent *Christ* both spake, and did much more than ever was written, how well doth your *Church* acquit her Office in being *Christ's Remembrancer*? And therefore I believe your *Church* will be guilty of the same rashness with any private Person in *St. Augustine's Opinion*, *In offering to determine what Christ said when either he held his peace, or his words are not registred.*
- P. 68. As for those things which you mention for *Traditions*, not contrary to *God's written Word*, which yet are not an *unwritten Word*, such as the *Ceremonies of Baptism* by you mentioned, they are therefore not pertinent to our purpose, because they are only Rites and Ceremonies, and our discourse is about *Doctrinal Traditions* ; neither yet if I would spend time in the enquiry, could you derive them from *Apostolical Tradition*, notwithstanding what either you, or *Bellarmino* say. But the substance of all you have to say, pertinent to your purpose, is, *That though every Tradition be not God's unwritten Word, yet it being necessary for us to believe the Scripture to be the Word of God, we must believe it either for some word written or unwritten, or we shall have no Divine Faith at all of the Point, because all Divine Faith must rely upon some Word of God.* This being a great novelty with you, that is, something like Argumentation, it obliges me to take a little more particular notice of it. Any one that considers the force of this Argument, will find, that it lies wholly upon your notion of *Divine Faith*: For it appearing unreasonable to you, that our belief that the *Scripture* is the *Word*, should be resolved into the written *Word* it self ; therefore you find out an *unwritten Word of God* for a *Divine Faith* to fix it self upon, which can be nothing but some *Word of God*. To this therefore I answer, that when you say, *It is necessary we must believe the Scriptures to be the Word of God with Divine Faith*, this *Divine Faith* must be taken in one of these three senses ; either first, that *Faith* may be said to be *Divine*, which hath a *Divine Revelation* for its *Material Object*, as, that *Faith* may be said to be a *Humane Faith*, which is conversant about natural causes, and the effects of them: And in this sense it cannot but be a *Divine Faith*, which is conversant about the *Scripture*, because it is a *Divine Revelation*: Or, Secondly, a *Faith* may be said to be *Divine*, in regard of its *Testimony*, or *Formal Object* ; and so that is called a *Divine Faith*, which is built on a *Divine Testimony*, and that a *Humane Faith* which is built on a *Humane Testimony*: Thus I assert, all that *Faith* which respects particular *Objects of Faith*, supposing the belief of the *Scriptures*, is in this sense *Divine*, because it is built on a properly *Divine Testimony* ; but the Question is, Whether that *Act of Faith* which hath the whole *Scripture*

as its *Material Object*, be in that sense Divine or no. Thirdly, *Faith* may be said to be *Divine*, in regard of the *Divine Effects* it hath upon the Soul of Man; as it is said in *Scripture*, to *purifie the Heart, overcome the World, resist Satan*, and his *Temptations, receive Christ, &c.* And this is properly a *Divine Faith*; and there is no question, but every Christian ought to have this *Divine Faith* in his Soul, without which the other sorts of *Divine Faith* will never bring Men to Heaven. But it is apparent, that all who heartily profess to believe the *Scriptures to be the Word of God*, have not this sort of *Divine Faith*, though they have so firm an assent to the Truth and Authority of it, that they durst lay down their Lives for it. The *Assent* therefore, we see, may be firm, where the effects are not saving: The Question now is, Whether this may be called a *Divine Faith* in the second sense, that is, Whether it must be built on a *Testimony Infallible*? For clearing which, we must further consider the meaning of this Question, *How we know Scripture to be Scripture*? Which may import two things, *How we know that all these Books contain God's Word in them*? Or, Secondly, *How we know the Doctrine contained in these Books to be Divine*? If you then ask me, Whether it be necessary that I believe with such a *Faith* as is built on *Divine Testimony*, that these Books called the *Scripture*, contain the Principles of the Jewish and Christian Religion in them (which we call *God's Word*) I deny it, and shall do so, till you shew me some further necessity of it than you have done yet; and my reason is, because I may have sufficient ground for such an *Assent*, without any *Divine Testimony*. But if you ask me, On what ground I believe the *Doctrine to be Divine, which is contained in these Books*; I then answer affirmatively, On a *Divine Testimony*; because God hath given abundant evidence, that this *Doctrine* was of *Divine Revelation*. Thus you see, what little reason you have to triumph in your Argument from *Divine Faith*, inferring the necessity of an *unwritten Word of God*. But, the further explication of these things must be reserved, till I come to the positive part of our way of *Resolution of Faith*. I now return.

Having, after your way (that is, very unsatisfactorily) attempted the vindicating your Resolution of Faith, from the Objections which were offered against it by his Lordship; you come now to consider the second way propounded by him for the resolving Faith, which is, *That Scripture should be fully and sufficiently known, as by Divine and Infallible Testimony, by the splendendency of that Light which it hath in it self only, and by the witness it can so give to it self*; against which he gives such evident Reasons, that you acknowledge the Relator himself hath sufficiently confuted it, and you agree with him in the Confutation. Yet herein you grow very angry with him, for saying, *That this Doctrine may agree well enough with your grounds, in regard you hold, that Tradition may be known for God's Word by its own Light, and consequently the like may be said of Scripture.* This you call aspersing you, and obtruding Falshoods upon you. Whether it be so or no, must appear upon examination. Two Testimonies are cited from A. C. to this purpose, the first is, *Tradition of the Church is of a Company, which by its own Light, shews it self to be Infallibly assisted.* Your Answer is, *That the word [which] must properly relate to the preceeding word Company, and not to the more remote word Tradition.* But what of all this? Doth any thing the less follow, which the Bishop charged A. C. with? For it being granted by you, *That there can be no knowing an Apostolical Tradition, but for the Infallibility of the present Church*; the same *Light* which discovers the Infallibility of that Company, doth likewise discover the Truth of Tradition. If therefore your Church doth appear infallible by its own *Light*, which is your own confession, May not

§. 8.

P. 69. n. 10.

P. 69. n. 3.

not the *Scripture* as well appear infallible by its own *Light*. For is there not as great *Self-evidence*, at least, that the *Scripture* is *Infallible*, as that your *Church* is *Infallible*? And therefore the way you take to shift the *Objection*, makes it return upon you with greater force: For, I pray tell me, how any *Company* can appear by its own *Light* to be assisted by the *Holy Ghost*, and not much more the *Holy Scripture* to be *Divine*? Especially seeing you must at last be forced to derive this *Infallibility* from the *Scriptures*. For, you pretend to no other *Infallibility*, than what comes by a promise of the *immediate assistance of the Holy Ghost*. How then can any *Company* appear by its own *Light*, to be thus infallibly assisted, unless it first appear by its own *Light*, that there was such a *Promise*? And how can that, unless it antecedently appear by its own *Light*, that the *Scripture*, in which the *Promise* is written, is the *Word of God*? You tell us, *A. C.'s intention is only to affirm, That the Church is known by her Motives of Credibility, which ever accompany her, and may very properly be called her own Light*, How well you are acquainted with *A. C.'s intention*, I know not, neither is it much matter: For, granting this to have been his intention, may not the *Scripture* be known by her *Motives of Credibility*, as well as the *Church*? And do not these accompany her, as much as the *Church*? And may they not be called her *Light*, as properly as those of the *Church*? It is plain then, by all the senses and meanings you can find out, in the very same, that you say the *Church* may be known by her own *Light*, the *Scripture* may much more; and therefore you have no reason to quarrel with his Lordship for affirming it.

P. 70.

The second Testimony produced, is, *That a Tradition may be known to be such by the Light it hath in it self; in which (you say) you find not one word of Tradition being known by its own Light*. But, who are so blind as those who will not see? I pray, what difference is there between a *Tradition* being known to be such by its own *Light*, and a *Tradition* being known by its own *Light*? Yes, say you, *known to be such, implies, that is, to be God's unwritten Word*; but are not *Doctrinal Traditions*, and an *unwritten Word*, with you the same thing? Can therefore a *Tradition* be known to be an *unwritten Word* by its own *Light*, and not be known to be a *Tradition* by its own *Light*? Nay, How can it possibly be known to be an *unwritten Word*, unless it first appears to be a *Tradition*? For *Tradition* containing under it both those that are *unwritten Words*, and those that are not; it must, in order of nature, be known to be a *Tradition*, before it can be known to be the other: As I must first know you to be a *living Creature*, before I can know you to be a *reasonable Creature*; and, I may much sooner know the one than the other. You do therefore very well when you have given us such occasion for sport, to give us leave to laugh at it, as you do in your next words.

S. 9.

But before you leave this Point, you have some graver matter to take notice of, which is, that you desire the Reader to consider what the *Relator* grants, viz. *That the Church now admits of St. James and St. Jude's Epistles, and the Apocalypse, which were not received for diverse Years, after the rest of the New Testament*. From which you wisely infer, *That if some Books are now to be admitted for Canonical which were not always acknowledged to be such, then upon the same Authority some Books may now be received into the Canon, which were not so in Ruffinus his time*. And therefore the *Bishop* doth elsewhere unjustly charge the *Church of Rome*, that it had erred in receiving more *Books* into the *Canon*, than were received in *Ruffinus his time*. To which I Answer, 1. By your own confession then, the *Church of Rome* doth now receive into the *Canon* more *Books* than she did in *Ruffinus his time*; from whence I enquire, whether the present *Church* of

of Rome were *Infallible* in *Ruffinus* his time in determining the *Canon* of the *Scripture*? If not, then the present Church is no *Infallible* propounder of the *Word of God*, and then all your discourse comes to nothing. If she were *Infallible* then, she cannot be now, for now she determines otherwise as to a main point of *Faith* than she did then; unless you will say, your Church can be *Infallible* in determining both parts of a contradiction to be true. 2. Is the integrity of the *Canon* of *Scripture* an *Apostolical Tradition*, or no? I doubt not, but you will say, It is; if so, Whether were these Books which you admit now and were not admitted then, known to be of the *Canon* by this *Apostolical Tradition*? If not, by what right come they now to be of the *Canon*? If so, then was not your Church in *Ruffinus*'s time, much to seek for her *Infallibility*, in defining what was *Apostolical Tradition*, and what not? 3. Your main principle on which the lawfulness of adding more Books to the *Canon* of the *Scripture* is built, is, That it is in the power of your Church judicially and authoritatively to determine what Books belong to the *Canon* of the *Scripture*, and what not, which I utterly deny. For it is impossible that your Church, or any in the world, can by any definition make that Book to be *Divine*, which was not so before such a definition: For the *Divinity* of the Book doth meerly arise from *Divine Revelation*. Can your Church then make that to be a *Divine Revelation*, which was not so? All that any Church in the world can do in this case, is, not to constitute any new *Canon*, which were to make Books *Divine* which were not so, but to use its utmost diligence and care in searching into the *authenticallness* of those Copies which have any pretence to be of the *Canon*, and whether they did originally proceed from such persons, as we have reason to believe had an *immediate assistance* of the *Holy Ghost*; and according to the evidence they find that the Church may declare and give in her verdict. For the Church in this case is but a *Jury* of *grand Inquest* to search into matters of *Fact*, and not a *Judge* upon the *Bench* to determine in point of *Law*. And that is the true reason, why the Books of the *New Testament* were gradually received into the *Canon*, and some a great while after others, as *St. James*, *St. Jude*, the *Epistle to the Hebrews*, and the *Apocalypse*; because at first, the Copies being not so publickly dispersed, there was not that occasion ministred to the Church for examination of them; upon which, when by degrees they came to be more publick, it caused scruples in many concerning them, because they appeared no sooner: especially if any passages in them seemed to gratifie any of the *Sects* then appearing; as the *Epistle to the Hebrews*, the *Novatians*; and the *Apocalypse*, the *Millennarys*: But when upon a through search and examination of all circumstances, it did appear that these Copies were *authenticall* and did originally proceed from *Divine Persons*, then they came to be admitted and owned for such by the *Universal Church*, which we call being admitted into the *Canon* of the *Scripture*. Which I take to be the only true and just account of that which is called the constituting the *Canon* of *Scripture*, not as tho' either the *Apostles* met to do it, or *St. John* intended any such thing by those words in the end of the *Apocalypse* (for that Book being as much liable to question as any, how could that seal the *Canon* for all the rest) much less, that it was in the power of any Church or Council, and least of all of the *Pope*, to determine what was *Canonical*, and what not: but only that the Church upon examination and enquiry, did by her *Universal* reception of these Books, declare it self satisfied with the evidence which was produced, that those were true and *authenticall Copies* which were abroad under such names or titles, and that there was great reason to believe by a continued tradition from the age and time these Books were written in, that they

were

were written by such persons, who were not only free from any design of imposture, but gave the greatest Rational evidence, that they had a more special and immediate assistance of God's Spirit. You see then, to how little advantage to your Cause you made this digression.

- §. 10. As to the third way propounded for resolving the Question, *How we know*
P. 70, 71. *the Scriptures to be the Word of God*, viz. by the testimony of the Holy Ghost; three things you object against the Bishop's discourse about it; First, that his discourse is roving and uncertain. 2. That notwithstanding his brags he must have recourse to a private spirit himself. 3. That tho' the Bishop would seem to deny it, divers eminent Protestants do resolve their Faith into the private spirit. This being the substance of what you say, I shall return a particular Answer to each of them. For the first you tell us, He delivers himself in such a roving way of discourse, as signifies nothing in effect as to what he would drive at. No! that is strange, when that which his Lordship drives at, is, to shew how far this opinion is to be allowed and how far not, which he is so far from roving in, that he clearly and distinctly propounds the state of the question and the resolution of it: which in short is this, If by the testimony of the spirit be meant any special revelation of a new object of Faith, then he denies the truth of it at last in an ordinary way, both because God never sends us to look for such a testimony, and because it would expose Men to the danger of Enthusiasms: but if by the testimony of the Spirit be meant the habit or the act of Divine infused Faith, by virtue of which they believe the object which appears credible, then he grants the truth but denies the pertinency of it, because it is quite out of the state of the question, which inquires only after a sufficient means to make this object credible, against all im-
P. 71, 72. peachment of folly and temerity in believing, whether Men do actually believe or not. And withal adds, that the question is of such outward and evident means, as other Men may take notice of, as well as our selves. Judge you now, whether this may be called roving; if it be so, I can freely excuse you from it in all the discourses I have met with in your Book, who abhor nothing more than a true stating, and methodical handling any question.

But yet (say you) the Bishop cannot free himself from that imputation of recurring to the private spirit, against any that should press the business home. Sure you refer us here to some one else who is able to press a business home, for you never attempt it your self; and instead of that, only produce a large testimony out of A. C. That he did not acquit the Bishop wholly of this. Whether he did or no is to little purpose, and yet those very words which his Lordship cites, are in your testimony produced out of him. Only what you add more from him, that he must be driven to it; that his Lordship denies, and neither A. C. or you have been able to prove it.

- But tho' the Bishop seems not only to deny any such private revelation himself, but will not confess that any Protestants hold it; yet (you say) there can be no doubt in this, since Calvin and Whitaker do both expressly own it. But according to those principles laid down before, both these testimonies are easily answered. For, 1. Neither of them doth imply any private revelation of any new object, but only a particular application of the evidence appearing in Scripture to the conscience of every believer. 2. That these testimonies do not speak of the external evidence which others are capable of, but of the internal satisfaction of every ones conscience. Therefore Calvin saith, *Si conscientiis*
Instit. l. 1. c. 7. sect. 4. *optimè consultum volumus, &c.* If we will satisfy our own consciences; not, If we will undertake to give a sufficient reason to others of our Faith. So Whitaker, *Esse enim dicimus certius & illustrius testimonium quo nobis persuadeatur*
Controv. de Script. q. 3. c. 1. *hos libros esse sacros, &c.* There is a more certain and noble testimony by which we may be persuaded that these Books are sacred, viz. that of the Holy Ghost.

3. Neither

3. Neither of these testimonies affirm any more, than the more judicious Writers among your selves do. Your *Canus* asserts the necessity of an internal efficient cause, by special assistance of the spirit moving us to believe, besides and beyond all humane authorities and motives, which of themselves are not sufficient to beget Faith, and this (a little after) he calls, *Divinum quoddam lumen incitans ad credendum*, A divine light moving us to believe; and again, *Interior lumen infusum à Spiritu Sancto*, an inward light infused by the Spirit of God. There is nothing in the sayings of the most rigid Protestants is more hard to explain or vindicate from a private revelation than this is: if, as you say, one would press it home. Nay hath not your own Stapleton, Calvin's very phrase of the necessity of the secret testimony of the Spirit that one believed the testimony and judgment of the Church concerning Scripture? And is there not then as much danger of Enthusiasm in believing the Testimony of your Church, as in believing the Scriptures? Nay, doth not your Gregory de Valentia rather go higher than the testimonies by you produced out of Calvin and Whitaker on this very subject, in the beginning of his discourse of the resolution of Faith? It is God himself, saith he, in the first place, which must convince and persuade the minds of Men of the truth of the Christian Doctrine, and consequently of the Sacred Scriptures, by some inward instinct and impulse; as it appears from Scripture itself, and is fully explained by Prosper. If you will then undertake to clear this inward instinct and impulse upon the minds of Men, whereby they are persuaded of the truth of Christianity and Scripture, from Enthusiasm and a private spirit you may as easily do it for the utmost which is said by Calvin, or Whitaker, or any other Protestant Divine. This therefore is only an argument of your desire to cavil, and as such I will pass it over. For what concerns the influence which the Spirit hath in the resolution of Faith, it will be enquired into afterwards.

The last way mentioned in order to the resolution of Faith, is that of Reason, which (his Lordship saith) cannot be denied to have some place to come in, and prove what it can. According to which (he tells us) no Man can be hindered from weighing the tradition of the Church, the inward motives in Scripture itself, all testimonies within, which seem to bear witness to it; and in all this (saith he) there is no harm: the danger is, when a Man will use no other scale but reason, or prefer reason before any other scale. Reason then, can give no supernatural ground into which a Man may resolve his Faith, that the Scripture is the word of God infallibly; yet Reason can go so high, as it can prove that Christian Religion, which rests upon the authority of this Book, stands upon surer grounds of nature, reason, common equity, and justice, than any thing in the world, which any Infidel, or meer naturalist, hath done, doth, or can adhere unto, against it, in that which he makes, accounts, or assumes as Religion to himself. This is the substance of his Lordship's discourse about the use of Reason; in which we observe,

1. That he doth not make reason a means sufficient to ground as Infallible belief, that Scripture is the word of God. And therefore you are guilty of notorious oscitancy, or wilful calumny, in telling us, That natural reason is introduced by the Bishop for that end. By which we may guess at the truth of what you say at the end of your interlocutory discourse between the Bishop and the Floathen, that you have not wronged him, by either falsely im- posing on him, or dissembling the force of his arguments, wherein you are so guilty,

Id statuentum est, auctoritatem humanam & incitamenta omnia illa prædicta, sive alia quacunque, adhibita ab eo qui proponit fidem, non esse sufficientes causas ad credendum ut credere tenemur, sed præterea opus est interiori causa efficiente, i. e. Dei speciali auxilio moventi ad credendum. Locor. theol. l. 2. c. 8. Resp. ad 4. arg. l. 2. c. 8. scđ. Jam si hac.

Arcanum hoc divini Spiritus testimonium prorsus necessarium est, ut quis Ecclesia testimonio ac iudicio, circa Scripturarum approbationem credat. Triplicat. advers. Whitak. cap. 3.

Et verò Deus ipse imprimis est qui Christianam doctrinam, atq; adeò Scripturam sacram veram esse, voce revelationis suæ, & interno quodam instinctu & impulsu humanis mentibus contestatur atq; persuadet; ut in eâ ipsa scriptura multis in locis est expressum, & præclare à Prospero Aquitanico explicatur. De Analyfi fidei l. 1. c. 1.

S. 11. P. 74. n. 13.

N. 14.

P. 72. l. 9. 10. P. 75. l. 3.

guilty, that the only extenuation of your crime had been, never to have professed the contrary. For you give us a hopeful specimen of your fair dealings at your entrance on this subject.

2. Though reason cannot give a supernatural ground whereby to resolve Faith as to the Scriptures being God's Word Infallibly; yet reason may abundantly prove to any one who questions it, the truth and reasonableness of Christian Religion. By which if you please, you may take notice of a double resolution of Faith; the one is, into the truth and reasonableness of the Doctrine of Christianity considered in it self; and the other is, into the Infallible means of the conveyance of that Doctrine to us, which is the Scripture. When therefore his Lordship offers to deal with a Heathen, he doth not as you, either fillily or wilfully, would make him say, *That he would prove infallibly to him, that the Bible is God's Word*, but that Christian Religion hath so much the advantage above all others, as to make it appear that it stands upon sure grounds of nature, reason, common equity and justice, than any thing in the world, which any one who questions it doth adhere unto. Which I think is a thing that no one, who understands Christian Religion, would be afraid to undertake against any Infidel of what sort or nature soever. These things being premised, your grand piece of Sophistry in the dispute between the Heathen and the Bishop, whom, you so solemnly introduce at a Conference about Religion, doth evidently discover it self. Wherein, you bring in your learned Heathen, as one desiring satisfaction in matter of Religion; but being not vers'd in Christian Principles, desires to be satisfied by the evidence of natural reason; which when the Bishop hath condescended to; your very next thing is, that your Heathen understands by his Lordships Book, that the sole foundation of our Faith is a Book called the Bible; which, saith he, you tell me must be believed Infallibly with every part and parcel in it, to be the undoubted Word of the true God, before I can believe any other point of Religion as it ought to be believed. As to which, your Heathen sees no ground to assent that it is God's Word. But by this way of management of your dispute, we may easily discern which way the issue of it is like to go. Doth his Lordship any where undertake to prove this in the first place Infallibly to a Heathen, *That the Bible must be Infallibly believed to be God's Word*? No, he offers to prove, first, the excellency and the reasonableness of the Christian Religion considered in it self. From whence you might easily conceive how the dispute ought to be managed; shewing first that the precepts of Christianity are highly just and reasonable, the Promises of it such as may induce any reasonable Man to the practice of those Precepts; and that the whole Doctrine is such, as may appear to any considerative person to have been very wisely contrived: That there is nothing vain or impertinent in it, but that it is designed for great and excellent purposes, the bringing Men off from the love of sin to the love of God; that it is impossible to imagine any Doctrine to be contrived with more advantage for promoting these ends, because it represents to us the highest expressions of the Kindness and Goodness of God to Man, and that the Promises made by God were confirm'd to the world by the death of his only Son; That since Mens natures are now so degenerate, God hath made a tender of Grace, and divine assistance, whereby to enable Men to perform the excellent duties of this Religion. That those things which seem most hard to believe in this Doctrine, are not such things as might have been spared out of it (as though God did intend only to puzzle Mens reason with them) but they are such mysteries, as it is impossible the wit of Man can conceive they should have been discovered upon better reasons, or for more excellent ends; as, that a Virgin should

should conceive by the immediate Power of God, to bring him into the World, who should be the Saviour of it; That there should be a Resurrection of Bodies, in order to a compleat felicity of them who obey this Doctrine; and so for others of a like nature: That supposing it possible such things should be, it is impossible to conceive they should be done upon better grounds, or for better purposes than they are in *Christian Religion*. This being now a short Draught or Idea of *Christianity*, is the first thing which I suppose any learned or inquisitive *Heathen* or *Infidel* should be acquainted with; if he finds fault with this, let him in any thing shew the incongruity or unreasonableness of it. If he acknowledge this Model of the Doctrine reasonable, his next scruple is, Whether this be truly the Model of it or no; for that end I tell him, we have a Book among us, which is, and ever hath been, by *Christians*, taken for granted, to comprize in it the Principles of *Christian Religion*; I bid him take it, and read it seriously, and see if that which I have given him as the Idea of *Christian Doctrine*, do not perfectly agree with that Book. I do not bid him presently absolutely and infallibly believe this Book to be God's Word, which is a very preposterous way of proceeding; but only compare the Doctrine with the Book, as he would do a Body of *Civil Law*, with the *Institutes* of it; or the Principles of any Science, with the most approved Authors of it. If after this search, he be satisfied, that the representation I gave him of *Christian Religion*, agrees with those Books we call the Bible; he yet further adds, that he acknowledges the Principles of our Religion to be reasonable; but desires to be satisfied of the Truth of them; I must further enquire, Whether he doth believe any thing else to be in the World, besides what he hath seen and heard himself? I may justly suppose his Answer Affirmative; I then demand upon what grounds? A. Upon the certain report of honest Men, who have seen and heard other things than ever he did. But why do you think honest Men's reports to be credible in such cases? A. Because, I see, they have no design or interest to deceive me in it. Will you then believe the report of such Men, whom, I can make it appear, could have no interest in deceiving you? A. I can see no reason to the contrary. Will you then believe such Men, who lost their lives to make it appear, that their Testimony was true? A. Yes. Will you believe such things, wherein Persons of several Ages, Professions, Nations, Religions, Interests, are all agreed that they were so? A. Yes, if it be only to believe a matter of fact on their Testimony; I can see no ground to question it. This is all I desire of you, and therefore you must believe that there was in the World such a Person as *Jesus Christ*, who died, and rose again; and, while he lived, wrought great Miracles to confirm his Doctrine with; and that he sent out Apostles to Preach this Doctrine in the World, who likewise did work many Miracles, and that some of these Persons the better to preserve and convey this Doctrine, did write the substance of all that *Christ* either did, or spake, and withall penned several Epistles to those Churches which were planted by them. These are all matters of Fact, and therefore on your former Principle you are to believe them. There are then but two Scruples left: Supposing all this true, yet this doth not prove the Doctrine Divine; nor the Scriptures, which convey it, to be Infallible. To which I answer, 1. Can you question, whether that Doctrine be Divine, when the Person who declared it to the World, was so divine and extraordinary a Person, not only in his Conversation, but in those frequent and unparallel'd Miracles which he wrought in the sight and face of his Enemies, who, after his death, did rise again, and converse with his Disciples, who gave evidence of their Fidelity in the Testimony they gave of it, by laying down their Lives to attest the Truth of it? Again,

Can you question the *Divinity* of that *Doctrine*, which tended so apparently to the Destruction of Sin and Wickedness, and the power of the evil Spirit in the World? For, we cannot think he would quit his possession willingly out of the Bodies and Souls of Men; that therefore which threw him out of both, must be, not only a *Doctrine* directly contrary to his Interest, but infinitely exceeding him in Power: And that can be no less than *Divine*. But still, you will say, *Is it not, besides all this, necessary to believe these very Books, you call the Scripture, to be divinely inspired; and how should I know that?* To that I answer, 1. That which God chiefly requires from you, is, the belief of the *Truth* and *Divinity* of the *Doctrine*; for that is the *Faith* which will bring you to Obedience, which is the thing God aims at. 2. If you believe the *Doctrine* to be *True* and *Divine*, you cannot reasonably question the *Infallibility* of the *Scripture*. For, in that you read, that not only *Christ* did Miracles, but his *Apostles* too; and therefore their *Testimony*, whether writing or speaking was equally *Infallible*; all that you want evidence for, is, that such *Persons* writ these *Books*, and that being a matter of fact, was sufficiently proved and acknowledged before. Thus you see, if we take a right method, and not jumble things confusedly together, as you do, what a satisfactory account may be given to any inquisitive Person; first, of the *Reasonableness*; next, of the *Truth*; and lastly, of the *Divinity*, both of the *Doctrine*, and the *Books* containing it, which we call the *Scripture*.

§. 12.

P. 77. n.
15.

Let us now again see, *How you make the Bishop and Heathen dispute*. The substance of which, is, *That you make your Heathen desire no less than Infallible evidence that the Bible is God's Word by conviction of natural Reason*; whereas his Lordship attempts only to make the *Authority of Scriptures* appear by such Arguments, as unbelievers themselves could not but think reasonable, if they weighed them with indifference. For, though, saith he, *this Truth, That Scripture is the Word of God, is not so demonstratively evident à priori, as to enforce assent, yet it is strengthened so abundantly with probable Arguments, both from the Light of Nature it self, and Humane Testimony, that he must be very wilful and self-conceited, that shall dare to suspect it*. And sure any reasonable Man in the World would think it sufficient to deal with an Adversary upon such terms. But, says your *Heathen*, *A Man cannot be infallibly certain of what is strengthened with but probable Arguments, since that which is but probably true, may also be said to be probably false*. Which being a thing so often objected against us by your party, must be somewhat further explained. How far *Infallibility* may be admitted in our belief, may partly be perceived by what hath been said already, and what shall be said more afterwards. That there is, and ought to be the highest degree of *actual Certainty*; I assert as much as you: But, say you, *The very Arguments being but probable, destroy it*: To which I answer, by explaining the meaning of *probable Arguments*, in this case; whereby are not understood such kind of *Probabilities*, which cannot raise a firm *Assent*, in which sense we say, *That which is probable to be, is probable not to be*; but by *Probabilities*, are only meant such kind of *rational Evidence*, which may yield a sufficient foundation for a firm *Assent*, but yet notwithstanding, which an *obstinate Person* may deny *Assent*. As for Instance, if you were to dispute with the *Atheist* concerning the *Existence* of a *Deity*, which he denies, and should proceed with you just as your *Heathen* doth with the *Bishop*. Sir, All that Religion that you talk of, is but only upon the belief of a *God*, but I cannot be *infallibly convinced by natural Reason, that there is such a one*. You presently tell him that there is so much evidence for a *Deity*, from the works of nature, the consent of
all

all People, &c. that he can have no reason to question it. But still he replies, *None of these are demonstrations*, for notwithstanding I have considered these, I believe the contrary; but *demonstrations* would make me *infallibly certain*; these then are no more but *probable Arguments*, and therefore since it is but *probably true*, it may be *probably false*. How then will you satisfy such a Person? Can you do it any otherwise, than by saying, that we have as great Evidence as the nature of the thing will bear, and it is unreasonable to require more? Unless you will tell him, it is to no purpose to believe a God, unless he believe it *infallibly*; and there being no *Infallible Arguments* in nature, he must believe it on the *Infallibility of your Church*. And do you not think, this were an excellent way to confute *Atheists*? But when we speak of *probable Arguments*, we mean not such as are apt to leave the mind in suspense, whether the thing be true or no; but only such as are not proper and rigid demonstrations, or *Infallible Testimony*, but the *highest Evidence* which the nature of the thing will bear, and therefore may cause an *undoubted Certainty of Assent*. As it is in all matters of Fact; for, Will you say, that it is as *probable*, that there is not such a place as *Rome*, as that there is, because the only Argument you have to be convinced of it, is but in it self a *probability*, which is the fame and report of People. It is a piece therefore of great weakness of judgment, to say, That there can be no *certain Assent*, where there is a *meer possibility* of being deceived. For there is no kind of *Assent* in the humane understanding, as to the existence of any thing, but there is a *possibility of deception* in it. Will you say, because it is possible all Men's Senses may deceive them, therefore there can be no *certainly* of any Object of Sense? And, as well may you say it, as destroy any certainty of *Assent* in Religion, where you suppose a possibility of being deceived. But, if I be not much deceived (though I suppose you will account it a grand Paradox) an *Assent* may be as firm and certain upon moral grounds, as upon a demonstration, that is, when the matter is capable of no more than moral grounds. For, the reason why we suspend *Assent*, is the *unproportionateness* of the evidence to the matter to be proved: So when the matter is capable of more evidence than is produced, and I know it to be so, my understanding cannot firmly assent on such evidence; but when the matter is capable of no more than moral evidence, and I know it, I may as firmly assent to the Truth of such a thing, as to the Truth of a clearer thing, upon clearer evidence. Thus I may as firmly assent, that there are such places as the *East* and *West-Indies*, upon the constant report of Men, as that the *three Angles of a Triangle*, are equal to two right Angles: I say not, the evidence is the same, but that the assent may be as firm. You cannot then destroy the certainty of assent, which is required to *Christian Religion*, by telling Men, that the Arguments they rely on, are but *moral Arguments*: And by this, you may see, there may be a degree far beyond probability in the assent, where the Arguments in themselves considered, may be called *probable*; or rather, that *moral Certainty* may be a most firm, rational, and undoubted Certainty. Your following Discourse between the Bishop and Heathen, runs upon the former mistake, as though his intention were to prove first the Bible to be God's Infallible Word, before he would prove *Christian Religion* to be true, which I have already shewed you, is a mistake, which appears sufficiently by his own words, of proving the *Christian Religion* to stand upon surer grounds than any other Religion; not only than that one which the Heathen believed, but any other in the World: And therefore your Objection is answered, that for all this, a third Religion may be truer than both. Your remaining Discourse proves nothing at all, but on the former Supposition; and therefore, supposing his intention be

P. 80. n.
18.

be to prove Christianity to be True and Divine, his Argument from the power of it over the Devil, follows plainly enough. And when he mentions the evidence of it out of Scripture, he doth not suppose the belief of it as an *Infallible Word of God*, but only as of any other History, and therefore is far from such a *petitio principii*, as you imagine. That which the Bishop saith, may reasonably be supposed, as a Principle in Divinity (as there are postulata in other Sciences) is not the *Infallibility of the Doctrine, or Revelation*, but the *Credibility of both*, in order to further Conviction concerning their *Infallibility*; for, unless the *Credibility* of it be first assumed as a Principle, Men will not use the means in order to conviction of its *Infallibility*. And in this sense he doth not contradict himself, nor unsay what he had said before; and that this was his sense, appears by the last words of that Discourse, *That a meer natural Man may be thus far convinced, that the Text of God is a very credible Text*. Thus we see, how much, notwithstanding your protestation to the contrary, You have wronged the Bishop, both by falsely imposing on him, and dissembling the force of his Argument: And how unjust that imputation is, That if his Doctrine had been held in the Primitive Church, it would have laid the World under an impossibility of being converted to Christianity; whereas I have shewed how consonant his way is, as I explained it, both to reason, and the proceedings of the Primitive Christians in the conversion of learned Heathens.

§ 13.

But since you will needs let the Bishop to convert a learned Heathen, I will see what an excellent faculty you have according to your Principles of satisfying an Atheist, or a Sceptick in Religion, whom, for your sake, I will suppose more desirous of satisfaction, than commonly such Persons are. Let us see then how he accosts you.

Scept. Sir, I understand by a great Book of yours, that you have only taken the right course to convince such Persons as my self, who are a little doubtful concerning the received Principles of Religion in the World; for the wisest I have conversed with, of those who own those things, do offer only to prove them by Reason and Arguments, which, I understand, you decry, as a way to make all Men such as I am: But that you have an excellent Recipe for Men under my distemper; for you promise them no less than *Infallible Certainty* in all things you require them to believe, which is a thing I have been so long seeking for, and have yet so unhappily mist of, that I cannot but rejoyce in meeting with such a healing Priest, who offers nothing short of *Infallibility* in all Matters of Religion.

T. C. Sir, I question not, but before you and I part, I shall cure those distorted joints of your mind, and instead of being a Sceptick, make you a sound Catholick. For indeed it is true, what you say, That those who would convince you by Reason, do but offer to make you more a Sceptick than you are, at least, you can have no Divine Faith at all upon such Principles; but if you will follow my counsel, I doubt not but to make you *Infallibly certain* in the things we require you to believe.

Scept. I see then there is hope of a cure for me; but I pray tell me what that is I must be *Infallibly certain* of, and by what means I shall attain it. I would therefore in the first place be *Infallibly certain* of the Being of God, and the Immortality of Souls, for these I take to be the Principles of all Religion.

T. C. You take a wrong Method, you should first enquire after the means of this *Infallible Certainty*, for when once you have got that, it will make you *Infallibly certain* of what ever you desire; but as long as you use still so much Reason, as to demand *Infallible Certainty* in Principles before Conclusions, there is little hopes of your being a true Roman Catholick. But I must

I must tell you, this is not the way: You must first believe the Church, and then you may believe any thing.

Scept. But would you have me attain *Infallible certainty*, without any reason that is *Infallible*? But because you quarrel with my method, I will yield to yours, but let me desire to know first, *What those things are which I must believe upon this Infallibility?* and then, *Whether nothing short of this Infallible certainty will serve in order to Faith?* for if so, I must confess myself not only a *Sceptick* but an *Infidel*.

T. C. All objects of Faith must be believed with *Infallible certainty*, and nothing short of that can be true Faith, for true Divine Faith must rely on Divine Authority, or some Word of God: now because you cannot rely on God's written word for the Divine Authority of it self, you must rely on some Divine unwritten word; which can be no other but what is delivered by the *Infallible Testimony* of the present Roman Church.

Scept. I was in hopes, you intended my cure, but now I perceive you aim at making me worse; for I never heard so many things uttered in a breath with so great confidence, and so little shew of reason; that if I were not a *Sceptick* already, I should Commence one now. You tell me indeed very magisterially, that I cannot believe without *Infallibility*, because Faith must rely on a *Divine Testimony*; this *Divine Testimony* is not in Scripture (as you call it) but in the *Infallibility* of your present Roman Church; I find my doubts so increase by this discourse of yours, that they all croud so to get out, I know not how to propose them in order, but as well as I can. You tell me the ground why you require *Infallible certainty*, is, because Faith must rest on Divine Authority, and that this Authority must be that of your Church, which you say is *Infallible*: these things therefore I desire of you, first, to shew how your Churches Authority comes to be Divine. 2. How her Testimony comes to be *Infallible*. 3. How I may be *Infallibly certain* of this *Infallibility*. 4. Supposing the *Catholick Churches Testimony* to be so, how such a *Sceptick* as I am, should know your Roman Church to be that *Catholick Church*.

T. C. Your first question is, *How our Churches Authority comes to be Divine?* I see there is little hopes of doing good on you, that ask such questions as these are; you ought quietly to submit your Faith to the Church, and heartily believe all these things without questioning them; for I must tell you, such kind of questions have almost ruined us, and hath made scrupulous Men turn *Hereticks*, and others *Atheists*: but since I hope your questions may go no further than my answers, nor be any better understood, I must tell you; That though we say, that it is necessary that Divine Faith must rely on Divine Authority because that seems to promise *Infallibility*; yet when we come to our Churches Testimony, we dare not for fear of the *Hereticks* call it Divine, but *Infallible*, and in a manner, and after a sort Divine, hoping they would never take notice of any Contradiction in it, but still we say, *As far as concerns precise Infallibility, it is so truly supernatural and certain, that it comes nothing short of the Divinest Testimony; but yet this is not Divine, though it be by the Testimony of the Holy Ghost, and yet is no immediate revelation; but still it is so much, as if the Church should erre, God's veracity may be called in question as soon as the Churches.*

Scept. I took you for a Priest before, but now I take you for an absolute conjurer: but I confess, I like this discourse well, for I perceive your Religion is built on such grounds, as you never intend should be understood, wherein I commend your discretion; for these distinctions will doubtless do your work among silly and ignorant people, which are a great part of Mankind, and much the greatest of your Church. I am therefore infinitely satisfied with this

this answer to my *first question*; answer but the rest so, and I promise you to be less a *Sceptick* than ever I was.

T.C. To your second, *How her Testimony comes to be Infallible*; because I perceive you are an *understanding person*, I will acquaint you with our way, The *Hereticks* trouble us with this *question* above all others: for they presently cry out, If you know the *Scripture* to be *Infallible* by the *Church*, and the *Church* *Infallible* by *Scripture*, we run into a *Circle*; and this we know as well as they, but do not think fit to let the people know it, and therefore we tell them of *things being known in themselves and to us*, between the *formal object* and the *Infallible witness*, between the *principal cause* and a *condition prerequisite*, between *proving of it to Hereticks* and to *our selves*; but I see some of my brethren of late have been much beholding to some things with *vi-zards* upon them called *Motives of credibility*, and the generality are so frightened with them, that they will rather say they are satisfied than ask any more *questions*; but if they do, these do so little in *truth* belong to our *Church*, that then we storm, and sweat, and cry out upon them as *Athe-ists*, and that it is impossible they should believe any Religion who question them; and if that doth it not, then we patter over the former *distinctions* as we do our *prayers*, and hope they are both in an *unknown tongue*.

Scept. Well, I see you are the Man like to give me *satisfaction*; I pray to your third question, *How I may be Infallibly certain of this Infallibility*?

T.C. That is a question never asked by *Catholicks*, and if we find any propounding it whom we hoped to proselyte, we give them *hard words* and leave them; for because we offer to prove our *Infallibility* by only *motives of credibility*, they presently ask us, Whether our *Infallibility* be an *Article of Faith*? if it be, then they may believe an *Article of Faith without Infallible certainty*, and then what need our *Churches Infallibility*? and then to what end do we quarrel with their *Faith* for being built on greater *motives of credibility*? which being such untoward questions we see there is no good to be done on them and so leave them: but in our *Books* we are sure to cry out of the *fallibility* and *uncertainty* of the *Faith of Protestants*, because they acknowledge their *Church is not Infallible*, and cry up our *Church* because she *pretends* to it; if they ask, How we prove it, we seek to confound the *state of the question*, and run out into the *necessity of an unwritten Word*, or bring such *motives* as hold only for the *Primitive* and *Apostolical Church*, and make them serve ours too. If all this will not do, we have other *shifts* still, but it is not yet fit to discover them.

Scept. To your fourth *Question* (and then I will tell you my judgment) *How your Church comes to be called or accounted the Catholick Church*?

T.C. For this, though it seems strange to the *Hereticks*, how a *part* should be called or accounted the *whole*, yet to all true *Catholicks*, who must *wink hard* that they may see the better, we make no great difficulty of it; for we tell them the *Pope* is *Christ's Vicar*, and it is the *head* which gives the *denomination*, and so *Catholick* is nothing else but a *name* to denote persons who are in our *Church*; and if they question this, they thereby are out of the *Church*, and so *under damnation*; But for the sturdy *Hereticks* who deride our *thunderbolts*, we are put to a greater trouble, and are fain to gather all the *citations* of the *Fathers* against the poor *Donatists*, and apply them to the *Hereticks*, and whatever they say belongs to the *Catholick Church* we confidently arrogate it to *our selves*, as tho' our *Church* now were the same with the *Catholick Church* then: and chiefly we have the advantage of the *Protestants* by this, that whatever *corruptions* they charge us with, they had the good *hap* to be almost generally received at the time *Luther* appeared,

appeared, and upon this we *thunder* them with the *Succession* and *Visibility* of our Church; as the *Samaritans* were much to blame they did not serve the *Israelites* so, after their return from *Captivity*; for they had a *continual Succession* in the same *place*, and a greater *visibility* than the *Israelites* under their *Bondage*; but yet we had the advantage of them by a larger *spread*, a longer *prescription*, and a fairer *show*.

Scept. Sir, I am hugely taken with these Discourses of yours, and easily perceive (whatever they that believe *Christian Religion* to be true think) that you are Men of *Wit and Parts*; and understand your *Interest*, I mean your *Religion*. I understand now thoroughly, to what *intent* it is you say, that *Those who build their Faith on rational Grounds, go about to destroy Religion*. I confess, you have taken the only way to reclaim me from any thing of *Scepticism*. I suppose you understand my meaning, as I do yours.

In this Discourse I pretend not, as you did, to deliver his Lordship's words, and so wrong him by falsely imposing them on him in another sense than he intended them, but collect from your former managery of this Controversie, what your real *sense* and *meaning* is, and how excellent a way this is, instead of reclaiming *Atheists* to make them so. If I have mistaken your meaning, I pray speak more clearly, and then we shall think you mean *honestly*; but as long as you walk so much in the *dark*, you will give us leave to suspect your design is either upon our *Purses* or our *Religion*. I now return to your *Church-tradition*.

You begin your sixth Section with a fair *Supposition*, and carry it on accordingly, which is of a Child brought up in your Church, who is commanded to believe the *Scriptures*, and all other *Articles of Faith* on the Authority of your Church, whom you suppose to die without once looking into the *Scriptures*: Your question is, *Whether he had saving Faith or no; if so, then the Churches Authority is a sufficient ground for Infallible Faith; if not, then he had none at all, and consequently could not be saved.* I answer, We pry not into *Divine Secrets*, on which account we dare not pronounce of the final condition of such, who through ignorance cannot be acquainted with God's written Word; we therefore say, that an hearty assent to the *Doctrine* of the Gospel is the *Faith* which God requires, and if this *Faith* lead Men to Obedience to God's Will, we assert the sufficiency of it for Salvation, and not otherwise; for *Faith* is not therefore *saving*, because built on an *Infallible ground*, as you fondly seem to imagine; but when it attains its end, when it brings Men to a hearty obedience to the *Precepts* of the Gospel. And if some among you, may believe that which is in it self true, but upon weak and insufficient grounds, as the advantages of Education (which are much rather the foundation of the Faith of such a one as you speak of, than any *Infallibility* supposed by him in the Church) yet such, and so great is the Goodness of God, that if a *Faith* standing on such grounds do attain its end, that is, make such a one universally holy, we deny not, but God may accept of it for Salvation. But still we say, such a *Faith* is so far from being *Infallible*, that it is not built on any sufficient or satisfactory ground, for the motive of it is that, which may be false as well as true; for he that assents to any thing on the Authority of any Church, before he doth judge whether her Authority be to be relied on absolutely or no, may believe a *Falshood* as soon as truth upon that Authority; and the more he makes this his foundation, the more he is in danger of being deceived. As suppose a Child brought up in *Turky*, and instructed in that Religion; he is told that he must without examination believe *Mahomet's Alcoran* to be *Divine*; and he must neither doubt of this, nor of any other Article of Faith, universally received among

Mahometans : May not such a one as invincibly believe the Authority of the *Turkish Church* (if we may call it so) as your *Child* doth the Authority of your *Church* ? Where then lies the difference ? You see plainly, it cannot be in the *Motive* to Faith, for the *Authority* is supposed equally *Infallible* in both ; but it lies in the evidence of *Truth* in one Religion above the other, and this requires something more than the *Authority* of the *Church*, viz. judgment and diligent examination. And then Faith is built on a sure ground. Remember then, that we enquire not what abatements God makes for the *Prejudices* of *Education* in believing or not believing any Religion ; nor how *God* intends to deal with them, who through Age, or other invincible *Prejudices* are incapable of judging the evidence of truth in any Religion ; but what are the certain *grounds* of *Faith*, which sober and understanding Men, may and ought to build their belief of true Religion upon. But you proceed, and suppose your young *Christian* to live, and apply himself to study, and becomes a learned Man, and then upon the *Churches* recommendation betakes himself to the reading the *Scriptures* ; upon which by the light he discovers in it he finds the *Faith* he had before, was but a humane persuasion, and not a *Divine Faith*, and consequently that he had no saving *Faith* of any *Article* of *Christian* belief, and so was out of the *State* of *Salvation* ; from whence (you say) will spring *Gripes* and *Torture* of *Spirit* among *Christians*. And, why so ? What, because they discern greater reason to believe than ever they did, must they find *Gripes* and *Torture* of *Spirit* ? I had thought, the more *Light* Men had found, i. e. the more *reason* for believing, the more *Peace* and *Contentment* they had in their *Minds*. And so I verily believe it is : But probably your meaning is, *This Doctrine will cause Gripes and Torture of Spirit in those who have no other foundation of Faith, but your Churches Authority, and never enquire after more* : If it does so, much good may they do them ; and I verily believe, such doubts may tend more to their satisfaction at last, than their present security ; and a *Doctrine* which tends to convince the *World* of their *Folly* and *Unreasonableness* of such a kind of *implicite Faith*, the unsuitableness of it to the nature of *Religion* in general, but more especially the *Christian* (whose great commendation is, that it puts Men upon so much searching and enquiry into the truth of it) would tend more to the good of the *Christian World*, than any of those *soft* and *ease* *Principles* which you seek to keep Men in *Obedience* by, and that I am afraid more to your *Church* than to *Christ*. Why then such a *Doctrine* should cause *needless Gripes and Tortures of Spirit*, I cannot imagine : It must certainly be a great confirmation to the *mind* of any good Man to see still further *reason* for his *Faith*, by which it grows more radicated and confirmed. Or would you have a Man disquiet himself, because he is not still a *Child* ? Much such a kind of thing this is, that a Man's mind must be *tortured*, because his *Faith* grows *stronger* ; for we assert that there are *degrees* in *Faith* ; which you who make all *Faith* *Infallible* cannot do, unless you suppose an *Infallible thing* may grow more *Infallible*. And if all true *Faith* be *Infallible*, how can Men pray for the *increase* of *Faith*, unless they pray for the increase of their *Infallibility* ; which is a *Prayer*, I suppose, not many in your *Church* are allowed to make, for then what becomes of your *Pope's Prerogative*, when not only every one among you is supposed to be *Infallible*, but hopes as well as prays to be more *Infallible*, which is more than your *Pope* or your *Church* dares pretend to.

But whether *Doctrine* tends more to *inward gripes* and *tortures of Spirit*, yours or ours, let any reasonable Man judge ; for we assert that *true Faith* is capable of *degrees* of *augmentation*, but you assert that there is no *Divine Faith* but

but what is *Infallible*; when therefore Men by reflection upon themselves, are so far from finding such an *Infallibility* in their *Assent*, that they combat with many doubts and fears, as we see the *Apostles* did even after the *Resurrection of Christ*; you must pronounce that the *Apostles* when they questioned *Christ's Resurrection* from the Dead had no *Divine Faith* at all: For it is plain they were far from an *Infallible assent* to it, when *Christ* upbraided them with their unbelief and hardness of heart, because they believed not them which had seen him after he was risen. Were they infallible in their assent then or no? I hope you will not contradict *Christ* so much as to say so? Or had they no *Divine Faith* then at all? Was not *St. Peter*, for whom *Christ* prayed that his *Faith* should not fail, and from the indefectibility of whose *Faith* you derive that of the *Pope*? (But here you may see what a certain Foundation you have for it, when it is so apparent here, that *St. Peter's Faith* did fail, and that as to so important an *Article of Faith*, as *Christ's own Resurrection*; for certainly, *St. Peter* was one of the eleven.) Nay, Doth not *Christ* upbraid them for their unbelief, in not believing them that had seen him after he was risen? We see then, *Christ* chides them for not resolving their *Faith* into a humane and moral Testimony; If you had been there, no doubt you must have told him, He was mistaken in the nature of *Faith*, which could rest on nothing but an infallible Testimony; and unless he shewed you by sufficient Motives, that those Persons who saw him risen, were infallible, for all his haste you were not bound to believe him. But, whether *Christ* or you be the more infallible, judge you. We see our *Blessed Saviour* requires no more *Assent*, than the nature of the thing will bear, nay, he upbraids those who will not believe upon *Moral and Humane Testimony*; but you say just the contrary, as though you were resolved to contradict him: But that is sufficient Argument to all *Christians*, of the falsity and folly of your Doctrine, which tends to no other end, but to make all considering Men *Scepticks*, or *Atheists*. For, when you lay it down as a certain Maxim, that no *Faith* can be *Divine*, but what is *Infallible*; and they find no such *Infallibility* in the grounds or the nature of Men's *Assent*; What then follows, but those worst sort of *Gripes* and *Tortures*, such as argue an inward *Convulsion* of Mind, and bring Men to a greater Question, Whether there be any such thing, as that you call true *Divine Faith* in the World? You go on with your *Catechumen's Discourse*, who must suppose, Either that the Church taught, that he was to believe *Scripture* *Infallible*, upon her own *Infallible Testimony*, or not; If so, then he reflects, that this Church hath plainly deceived him, and all others, who believed upon that Supposition, and so exposed them all to the hazard of eternal Damnation; and therefore was no true Church, but a deceiver. From whence (say you) he gathers, that her recommendation of *Scripture*, is as much as nothing, and so at last, is left to the sole Letter of *Scripture*, and so must gather from thence its Authority, or there can be no means left him on the Bishop's own Principles, to believe infallibly that *Scripture* is *Divine*, and the true Word of God. This Discourse of yours consists of three Absurdities, which will follow upon one of your Churches questioning her *Infallibility*.

1. That then your Church will be guilty of *Imposture*.
2. Then the Churches Testimony signifies nothing.
3. That then the sole Letter of *Scripture* must assure Men of its *Divine Authority*.

For the first, I must confess him whom before you supposed a *Child*, to be now grown to Years of Understanding, since he doth so wisely reflect on himself, as to your Churches gross *Imposture*, in her pretence of *Infallibility*; and, no doubt, it is one of the greatest which hath been known in the *Christian World*, which you cannot your self deny, supposing that it be not true that she is *Infallible*. For, Can there be any higher

Cheat in the World, than under a pretence of *Infallibility*, to impose things upon Men's *Faith*, which are contrary to the *Sense* and *Reason* of Mankind, to keep them from that inward satisfaction, which their Souls might find from a serious consideration of the *excellent nature of Christian Religion*, and a diligent *practice* of it, to contradict thereby the very scope of *Christianity*, which *Courts* our esteem, by offering it self to the fairest Tryal; when, I say, under this pretence *Christian Religion* is apparently dishonoured, the welfare of Men's Souls hindered, and the greatest Corruptions obtruded, without possibility of amendment of them, excuse your *Church* from *Imposture* if you can; for my part, I cannot, nor any one else who thoroughly considers it. For the *second*; it will follow indeed, that the Testimony of your *Church* is as much as nothing, as to any *Infallible Foundation of Faith*; but yet it may be of great use for conveying *Universal Tradition* to us, and so by that delivering the *Scripture* into our hands, as the *Infallible Rule of Faith*. To the *Third*; It by no means follows, that there is nothing but the sole Letter of *Scripture* left to convince us of the *Divine Authority of Scripture*; I hope the *working Miracles*, *fulfilling Prophecies*, the *nature and reasonableness of the Doctrine of Scriptures*, are all left besides the bare Letter of *Scripture*; and these, we say, are sufficient to make us believe, that the *Scripture* contains the infallible Word of God.

§. 15. Now your profound *Christian* begins to reflect on the *Bishop's way*, which is (say you) *That the Testimony of the Church is Humane and Fallible*, and that the belief of the *Scripture* rests upon the *Scripture* it self. But, it will be more to our purpose, to hear the *Bishop* deliver his own Mind, than to hear you so lamely deliver it; which, in short, he sums up thus. A Man is probably led by the Authority of the present *Church*, as by the first informing, inducing, perswading means, to believe the *Scripture* to be the Word of God: But, when he hath studied, considered, and compared this Word with its self, and with other Writings, with the help of ordinary Grace, and a Mind morally induced, and reasonably perswaded by the Voice of the *Church*, the *Scripture* then gives greater, and higher Reasons of Credibility to it self, than *Tradition* alone could give. And then, he that believes, resolves his last and full Assent, that *Scripture* is of *Divine Authority*, into internal Arguments found in the Letter it self; though found by the help of *Tradition* without, and Grace within. This is the substance of his Lordship's Opinion, against which we shall now consider what your Discourser hath to object.

P. 83. P. 76. 1. The first, is from the case of ignorant and illiterate Persons; such, who either through want of Learning could not read the *Scripture*, and examine, or else made little use of it, because they supposed they might have *Infallible Faith* without it; What then becomes of millions of such Souls, both in former and present times? To this I answer; Although the Ignorance and Carelessness of Men in a matter of so great consequence, be so great in all Ages, as is not to be justified, because all Men ought to endeavour after the highest ways of satisfaction, in a matter so nearly concerning them (and it is none of the least things to be blamed in your *Church*, that she doth so much countenance this ignorance, and neglect of the *Scripture*) yet for such Persons, who either morally, or invincibly, are hindred from this capacity of examining *Scripture*, there may be sufficient means for their *Faith* to be built upon. For, although such illiterate Persons cannot themselves see, and read the *Scripture*, yet, as many as do believe, do receive the *Doctrine* of it, by that sense by which *Faith* is conveyed, that is, *Hearing*; and by that means they have so great certainty, as excludes all doubting, that such *Doctrines*, and such matters of fact, are contained in these Books, by which they come to the

the understanding of the nature of this *Doctrine*, and are capable of judging concerning the *Divinity* of it. For the *Light* spoken of in *Scripture*, is not a *Light* to the *eye*, but to the *mind*; now the *mind* is capable of this *light*, as well by the *ear*, as by the *eyes*. The case then of such *honest illiterate Persons*, as are not capable of reading *Scripture*, but diligently and devoutly hear it read to them, is much of the same nature with those who heard the *Apostles* Preach this *Doctrine* before it was writ. For, whatever was an Argument to such to believe the *Apostles* in what they spake, becomes an Argument to such who hear the same things, which are certainly conveyed to us by an *unquestionable Tradition*: So that nothing hinders, but such illiterate Persons may resolve their *Faith* into the same *Doctrine* and *Motives* which others do, only those are conveyed to them by the *ear*, which are conveyed to others by the *eyes*. But, if you suppose Persons so rude and illiterate, as not to understand any thing, but that they are to believe as the *Church* believes; do you, if you can, resolve their *Faith* for them; for my part, I cannot, and am so far from it, that I have no reason to believe they can have any.

2. The second thing objected by your Discourser is, *That if the Churches judgment be fallible, then much more one's own judgment is fallible. And therefore, if, notwithstanding all the care and pains taken by the Doctors of the Church, their perswasion was only humane and fallible; what reason hath any particular Person to say, That he is divinely and infallibly certain by his reading the Scripture, that it is Divine Truth?* But, 1. Is there no difference between the *Churches Perswasion*, and the *Churches Tradition*? Doth the *Bishop* deny, but the perswasion of the *Doctors* of the *Church*, is as *infallible*, as that of any particular Person? But this he dies, that they can derive that *Infallibility* of the grounds of their *Perswasion* into their *Tradition*, so as those who are to receive it on their *Testimony*, may be competent Judges of it. May we not then suppose their *Tradition* to be *humane* and *fallible*, whose perswasion of what they deliver, is established on *infallible grounds*? As a *Mathematician* is demonstratively convinced himself of the truth of any particular *Problem*; but, if he bids another believe it on his *Testimony*, the other thereby hath no *demonstrative evidence* of the *Truth* of it, but only so great *moral evidence*, as the *Testimony* of that Person carries along with it. The case is the same here: Suppose those Persons in the *Church* in every *Age* of it, have to themselves *infallible evidence* of the *Divinity* of the *Scripture*, yet when they are to deliver this to be believed by others, unless their *Testimony* hath *infallible evidence* in it, Men can never have more than *humane* or *moral certainty* of it. 2. It doth not at all follow, that if the *Testimony* of the *Church* be *fallible*, no particular Person can be *infallibly assured* of the *Divinity* of the *Scripture*, unless this assurance did wholly depend upon that *Testimony*; indeed, if it did so, the Argument would hold, but otherwise it doth not at all. Now, you know, the *Bishop* denies that the *Faith* of any particular Person doth rest upon the judgment of the *Church*; only he saith, This may be a *Motive* and *Inducement* to Men, to consider further; but that which they rely upon, is, that *rational evidence* which appears in the *Scripture* it self.

3. He goes on, and argues against this use of *Tradition*, thus, *If the Light of the Scripture be insufficient to shew it self, unless it be introduced by the Recommendation of the Church; How came Luther, Calvin, Zuinglius, Hulse, &c. to discover this Light in it, seeing they rejected the Authority of all visible Churches in the World?* &c.

Sure your Discourser was not very profound in this, that could not distinguish between the *Authority of Universal Tradition*, and the *Authority* of

of the present visible Church, or between the *Testimony* of the Church, and the *Authority* of it. Shew us where *Luther, Calvin, &c.* did ever reject the *Authority* of an *uncontrouled universal Tradition*, such as that here mentioned concerning the *Scriptures being the Word of God*: Shew us where they deny that *Use* of the *Testimony* of those Churches, whose *Authority* in imposing *Matters of Faith* they denied, which his *Lordship* asserts, viz. to be a means to introduce Men to the knowledge and belief of the *Scriptures*; and, unless you shew this, you do nothing.

4. He argues against that *Light* in Scripture, *because it is not sufficient to distinguish Canonical Books from such as are not so*; For (says he) Had not the *Ancient Primitive Fathers* in the first three hundred Years, as much reason and ability to find this *Light* in Scripture, as any particular Person? Yet many Books which do appear to us to be *God's Word*, by their *Light*, did not appear to be so to them by it, till they were declared such by the *Catholick Church*. I answer, 1. Where doth his *Lordship* ever say, or pretend, that any Person, by the *Light* contained in the Books, can distinguish Books that are *Canonical*, from such as are not? All that can be discovered, as to particular Books in question, is, the examination of the *Doctrine* contained in them by the *Series* of that, which is in the unquestionable Books; for, we know, that *God* can never speak *contradictions*: But still this will only serve to exclude such Books as contain things contrary, but not to admit all which have no *Doctrine* contrary to Scripture. 2. The reason why the *Primitive Fathers* questioned any Books that we do not, was not because they could not discover that *Light* in them, which we do; for neither can we discover so much *Light* in any particular Book, as meerly from thence to say, It is *Canonical*; but there was not sufficient evidence then appearing to them, that those Copies did proceed from *Apostolical Persons*; and this was therefore only an Argument of that commendable Care and Caution which was in them, lest any Book should pass for *Canonical*, which was not really so. 3. When the *Catholick Church* declared any controverted Book to be *Canonical*; Did not the Church then see as much *Light* in it as we do? But that *Light* which both the Church and we discover, is not a discriminating *Internal Light*, but an *External Evidence* from the sufficiency, and validity of *Testimony*. And such we have for the *Canonical Books of the Old Testament*; and therefore you have no cause to quarrel with us, for receiving them from the *Jewish Synagogue*; For who, I pray, are so competent witnesses of what is delivered, as they who received it? And the *Apostle* tells us, *That to the Jews were committed the Oracles of God*.

5. Hence your discoursing *Christian* argues, *That if one take up the Scripture on the account of Tradition, then if one should deny St. Matthew's Gospel to be the written Word of God, he could not be accounted an Heretick, because it was not sufficiently propounded to him to be God's Word*. Whether such a Person may be accounted a *Heretick* in your sense, or no, I am sure he is in *St. Paul's*, because *ἀπορριπτός*, self-condemned, and that for the very contrary reason to what you give, *because this is sufficiently propounded to him*. I pray tell me, What way you would have such a thing sufficiently propounded as a matter to be believed, that this is not propounded in? Would you have an unquestionable evidence, that this was writ by one of *Christ's Apostles*, called *St. Matthew*? So you have. Would you have all the Churches of *Christ* agreed in this *Testimony* in all Ages from the *Apostles* times? So you have. Would you have it delivered to you by the *Testimony* of the present Church? So you have. What then is, or can be wanting, in order to a *Proposition* of it to be believed? Why, forsooth, some

infallible,

infallible, authoritative sentence of the present Church, which shall make this an Object of Faith. See what a different mould some Men's minds are of from others! For my part, should I see, or hear any *Church* in the World, undertaking such an office as that, I should be so far from thinking it more sufficiently propounded by it, that I should not scruple to charge it with the greatest Presumption and Arrogance that may be. For, on what account can it possibly be a thing credible to me, that *St. Matthew's Gospel* contains *God's written Word* any further, than it is evident that the *Person* who wrote it, was one chosen by *Christ*, to deliver the summ of his proceedings, as an *Apostle*, to the World? And therefore I have no reason to think, he would deceive Men in what he spake or writ: The only Question then is, How I should know this is no counterfeit name, but that *St. Matthew* writ it? Let us consider, what possible means there are to be assured of it. I cannot imagine any but these two; Either that *God* should immediately reveal it either to my self, or to some *Church* to propound it to me; or else, that I am to believe those *Persons* who first received those *Copies* from his hands, by whose means they were dispersed abroad in the World, from whence they are conveyed by an *unquestionable Tradition* down to us. Of these two, chuse whether you please: If the *first*, then particular *immediate Revelations* are necessary to particular *Persons*, to have such an *Object of Faith* sufficiently propounded to them, and then the *Church* cannot authoritatively pronounce any *Books of Scripture* to be *Canonical*, without immediate Revelation to her; that this Book was written by such a *Person*, who was *divinely assisted* in the writing of it. And this you have denied before to belong to the *Church*. If you take up with the *second*, the *unquestionable Testimony of all Ages, since the Apostles*; then judge you whether *St. Matthew's Gospel* be not sufficiently propounded to be believed; and consequently, Whether any one who should question or deny it, be not guilty of the greatest peevishness and obstinacy imaginable. From hence we may see, with what superfluity of discretion the next words came from you; *Nay, hence it follows, that even our Blessed Saviour, who is Wisdom it self, would have been esteemed by all the World, not a wise Law-giver, but a meer Ignoramus and Impostor.* For shame, Man, forbear such insolent expressions for the future, and repent of these. For, Must *Christ's Wisdom* be called in question, and he liable to be accounted an *Ignoramus and Impostor*, if he doth not make your *Church Infallible*? I have told you often before, how much your *Doctrine of Infallibility* tends to *Atheism*, and now you speak out. For the meaning of your words plainly is, *If God hath not entrusted your Church with a full and absolute power to declare what is his Will, and what not, Christ was an Ignoramus and Impostor.* For that is the substance of your next words. For, *had he not framed, think you, a strange and Chimerical Common-wealth, were it alone destitute of a full and absolute power, to give an authentical and unquestionable Declaration, which is the true and genuine Law?* Now, it is evident from all your Discourse foregoing, you only plead for this full and absolute power in *your Church*; and judge you then what the consequence is (to all those who cannot see any shadow of reason for this your pretended Infallibility) neither more nor less, than that *Christ's* is liable to be accounted by all the World an *Ignoramus and Impostor*: Nay, that they are fools, who account him not so; if they do not believe this *present Infallibility of your Church*; for it is apparent (say you) that he hath ordered his *Common-wealth* worse than ever any one did. And now let any that consider what pitiful silly proofs you have produced for this *present Infallibility* (nay, such, that I am confident, that you cannot think your self you have in the least measure proved it) then judge, what thoughts

thoughts of *Christ* you are forced to entertain your self upon your own Argument, viz. as of an *Ignoramus* and *Impostor*. Hath not your *Infallibility* led you now a fine dance? Is not this the way to make *Faith* certain, and to reclaim *Atheists*? I had thought it had been enough for your *Canonists*, to have charged *Christ* with *Indiscretion*, if he had not left a *Vicar* on Earth; but now, it seems, the *profound Philosophers*, *learned Divines*, and *expert Historians* (for such a one, you told us, your discoursing *Christian* was supposed by you to be in whose name these words are spoken) do charge *Christ* with folly and imposture, if he hath not made your *Church* *Infallible*. For, shift it off as you can, you cannot deny but that must be the aim of these words: For you are proving the necessity of an *infallible Declaration* by the present *Church*, in order to a *sufficient Proposition* of the *Scripture* to be believed; and it is notorious you never pretend that any *Church* hath any share in this *Infallibility*, but your own; and therefore the consequence unavoidably follows, that since there can be no *sufficient Proposition*, that the *Scripture* is to be believed without this *infallible Testimony*; since no *Church* pretends to this *Infallibility*, but yours; since, without such provision for the *Church*, *Christ* would have been esteemed by all the *World* not a wise Law-giver, but a meer *Ignoramus* and *Impostor*; What then follows, but that if your *Church* be not *infallible*, He must be accounted so? And if you dread not these consequences; I hope all *Christians* do, and have never the better thoughts of your *Infallibility* for them.

6. Let us see, how he comes closer to the matter it self; and examines how this *Light* should be *Infallible*, and *Divine*, supposing the *Churches* *Testimony* to be humane and fallible. The substance of which, is this, If the *Church* may err, we may suppose she hath erred in testifying some Books to be *God's Word*; in that case, Books that were not *God's Word*, would be equally recommended with those that were: And that it would be impossible for any particular Person, by reading them, to distinguish the one from the other. To which I answer, 1. It is all one with you to suppose a *Church* fallible, and suppose that she hath erred. To put a case of a like nature. The *Testimony* of all Mankind is fallible; May you therefore suppose that all Mankind hath erred in something they are agreed in? The *Testimony* of all those Persons who have seen *Rome*, is fallible; May I therefore question whether they were not all deceived? But of this afterwards. 2. When you speak of the *Church* erring, Do you mean the *Church* in every Age since *Christ's* coming, concerning all the Books of *Scripture*? Or, the present *Church*, concerning only some Books of *Scripture*? If you suppose, the *Church* of all Ages should be deceived, you must suppose some, who were *Infallible*, should be deceived; those were the *Apostles* in writing and delivering their Books to the *Churches* of their time; or else you must suppose all the *Apostolical Churches* deceived in taking those Books to have come from the *Apostles*, which did not; And is not this a congruous Supposition? Well then, if it be unreasonable to suppose the *Apostolical Churches* deceived, and impossible to imagine the *Apostles* deceived, in saying, They writ what they did not: Where then must such an universal Error as this come in? Or, Is it not equally unreasonable to suppose all the *Christian Churches* in the *World* should be deceived, without any questioning of such a deceit, supposing but the goodness and common Providence of *God* in preserving such Records, and the moral Industry used by *Christians*, in a matter of such importance? It is therefore a very absurd and unreasonable thing, to imagine, That all the *Churches* of *Christ*, in all Ages, should err in receiving all the Books of *Scripture*. Let us then see, as to the present *Churches* erring, as to particular Books: 1. Either the Records of former Ages are left to judge by, or no? If they be, as certainly they are,

we

we thereby see a way to correct the *error* of the *present Church*, by appealing to these records of the *Church* in former times? if they be not left, how could any of these *Books* be derived from *Apostolical Tradition*, when we have no means to *trace* such a *Tradition* by? 2. Supposing only some *Books* questioned, or that the *present Church* errs only in some particular *Books*; then it appears that there remains a far greater number of such *Books*, whose Authority we have no reason at all to question, and by comparing the other with these we may easily prevent any very dangerous error; for if they contain any *Doctrine* contrary to the former, we have no reason to believe them; if they do not, there can be no very dangerous error in admitting them. Thus you see how easily this error is prevented, supposing the *Churches* testimony not only fallible, but that it also should actually err in delivering some *Books* for *Canonical*, which are not so: but supposing a *Church* pretends to be *Infallible* and is believed to be so, and yet doth actually err in delivering the *Canon of Scripture*, what remedy is there then? for while we look on the *Churches* testimony as fallible, there is scope and liberty left for enquiry and further satisfaction, but if it be looked on as *Infallible*, all that believe it to be so are left under an impossibility of escaping that error which she is guilty of. And the more dangerous such an error is, the worse the condition is of all such who believe the *Churches* Testimony *Infallible*. Now this is that we justly charge your Church with, that while she pretends to *Infallibility*, she hath actually erred in delivering such *Books* for *Canonical* which are not so, as hath been abundantly manifested by the *Worthies* of our Church. The remainder of this discourse of yours concerning knowing *Canonical Books* by the light in them, is vacated by our present answer; and so is the other concerning *Apostolical traditions* by our former, upon that subject. As to that *Scruple*, *How the light should be Infallible and Divine, when the Churches Testimony is humane and fallible*, it signifies nothing unless the light be only supposed to rise from the *Testimony*, which his Lordship denies.

7. The judgment of the *Fathers* is enquired into concerning the present subject; out of whom only *Irenæus* and *S. Augustin* are produced, as affirming in many places, That the *Tradition of the Church* is sufficient to found *Christian Faith* even without *Scripture*, and that for some hundreds of years after the *Canon of Scripture* was written. But must we stand only to the judgment of these two concerning the sense of the *Primitive Church* in this present Controversie? We may easily know the judgment of the *Fathers*, if two such lame Citations as these are, are sufficient to discover it. But your unhappiness is great in whatever you undertake: If you meddle with reason, you soon find how little it becomes you: If you fly to the *Fathers*, they prove the greatest witnesses against you; as will appear in this debate, if we first examine the citations you produce, and then shew how fully and clearly these very persons whom you have picked out of all the *Chorus*, do deliver themselves against you. The first citation is that known one, out of *Irenæus*. §. 16.

us, concerning those barbarous nations who believed without the *Scriptures*, adhering to the *Tradition of the Apostles*, having salvation written without *Paper and Ink*.

But what is it you would hence infer, I cannot imagine, unless it be one of these two things; 1. That if we had no *Scriptures* left us, it would be necessary for us to believe on the account of *Apostolical Tradition*; that is, that the grounds of our Faith were so clear and evident of themselves, that tho' they had never been written, yet if they had been conveyed by an unquestionable *Tradition* from the *Apostles*, there had lain an obligation on us

Quid autem, si neque Apostoli quidem scripturas reliquissent nobis, nonne oportebat ordinem sequi traditionis, quam tradiderunt iis quibus committebant Ecclesias? Cui ordinationi assentiunt multe gentes barbarorum, qui in Christum credunt, sine charta & atramento scriptam habentes salutem, & veterem traditionem custodientes.

Iren. l. 3. c. 4.

thoughts of Christ you are forced to entertain your self upon your own Argument, viz. as of an Ignoramus and Impostor. Hath not your Infallibility led you now a fine dance? Is not this the way to make False certain, and to reclaim Atheists? I had thought it had been enough for your Canonists, to have charged Christ with Indiscretion, if he had not left a Person on Earth; but now, it seems, the profound Philosophers, learned Divines, and expert Historians (for such a one, you told us, your dissembling Christian was supposed by you to be in whose name these words are spoken) do charge Christ with folly and imposture, if he hath not made your Church Infallible. For, shift it off as you can, you cannot deny but that must be the aim of these words: For you are proving the necessity of an Infallible Tradition by the present Church, in order to a sufficient Proposition of the Scripture to be believed; and it is notorious you never pretend that any Church hath any share in this Infallibility, but your own; and therefore the consequence unavoidably follows, that since there can be no sufficient Proposition, that the Scripture is to be believed without this Infallible Testimony; since no Church attends to this Infallibility, but yours; since, without such provision for the Church, Christ would have been esteemed by all the World not a wise Law-giver, but a meer Ignoramus and Impostor; What then follows, but that if your Church be not infallible, He must be accounted so? And if you dread not these consequences; I hope all Christians do, and have never the better thoughts of your Infallibility for them.

P. 77. 6. Let us see, how he comes closer to the matter it self; and examines how this Light should be Infallible, and Divine, supposing the Churches Testimony to be humane and fallible. The substance of which, is this, If the Church may err, we may suppose she hath erred in testifying some Books to be God's Word; in that case, Books that were not God's Word, would be equally recommended with those that were: And that it would be impossible for any particular Person, by reading them, to distinguish the one from the other. To which I answer, 1. It is all one with you to suppose a Church fallible, and suppose that she hath erred. To put a case of a like nature. The Testimony of all Mankind is fallible; May you therefore suppose that all Mankind hath erred in something they are agreed in? The Testimony of all those Persons who have seen Rome, is fallible; May I therefore question whether they were not all deceived? But of this afterwards. 2. When you speak of the Church erring, Do you mean the Church in every Age since Christ's coming, concerning all the Books of Scripture? Or, the present Church, concerning only some Books of Scripture? If you suppose, the Church of all Ages should be deceived, you must suppose some, who were Infallible, should be deceived; those were the Apostles in writing and delivering their Books to the Churches of their time; or else you must suppose all the Apostolical Churches deceived in taking those Books to have come from the Apostles, which did not; And is not this a congruous Supposition? Well then, if it be unreasonable to suppose the Apostolical Churches deceived, and impossible to imagine the Apostles deceived, in saying, They writ what they did not: Where then must such an universal Error as this come in? Or, is it not equally unreasonable to suppose all the Christian Churches in the World should be deceived, without any questioning of such a deceit, supposing but the goodness and common Providence of God in preserving such Records, and the moral Industry used by Christians, in a matter of such importance? It is therefore a very absurd and unreasonable thing, to imagine, That all the Churches of Christ, in all Ages, should err in receiving all the Books of Scripture. Let us then see, as to the present Churches erring, as to particular Books: 1. Either the Records of former Ages are left to judge by, or no? If they be, as certainly they are,

we

we thereby see a way to correct the *error* of the *present Church*, by appealing to these records of the *Church* in former times? if they be not left, how could any of these *Books* be derived from *Apostolical Tradition*, when we have no means to trace such a *Tradition* by? 2. Supposing only some *Books* questioned, or that the *present Church* errs only in some particular *Books*; then it appears that there remains a far greater number of such *Books*, whose Authority we have no reason at all to question, and by comparing the other with these we may easily prevent any very dangerous error; for if they contain any *Doctrine* contrary to the former, we have no reason to believe them; if they do not, there can be no very dangerous error in admitting them. Thus you see how easily this error is prevented, supposing the *Churches* testimony not only fallible, but that it also should actually err in delivering some *Books* for *Canonical*, which are not so: but supposing a *Church* pretends to be *Infallible* and is believed to be so, and yet doth actually err in delivering the *Canon of Scripture*, what remedy is there then? for while we look on the *Churches* testimony as fallible, there is scope and liberty left for enquiry and further satisfaction, but if it be looked on as *Infallible*, all that believe it to be so are left under an impossibility of escaping that error which she is guilty of. And the more dangerous such an error is, the worse the condition is of all such who believe the *Churches* Testimony *Infallible*. Now this is that we justly charge your Church with, that while she pretends to *Infallibility*, she hath actually erred in delivering such *Books* for *Canonical* which are not so, as hath been abundantly manifested by the *Worthies* of our Church. The remainder of this discourse of yours concerning knowing *Canonical Books* by the light in them, is vacated by our present answer; and so is the other concerning *Apostolical traditions* by our former, upon that subject. As to that *Scruple*, *How the light should be Infallible and Divine, when the Churches Testimony is humane and fallible*, it signifies nothing unless the light be only supposed to rise from the *Testimony*, which his Lordship denies.

7. The judgment of the *Fathers* is enquired into concerning the present subject; out of whom only *Irenæus* and *S. Augustin* are produced, as affirming in many places, That the *Tradition of the Church* is sufficient to found *Christian Faith* even without *Scripture*, and that for some hundreds of years after the *Canon of Scripture* was written. But must we stand only to the judgment of these two concerning the sense of the *Primitive Church* in this present Controversie? We may easily know the judgment of the *Fathers*, if two such lame Citations as these are, are sufficient to discover it. But your un happiness is great in whatever you undertake: If you meddle with reason, you soon find how little it becomes you: If you fly to the *Fathers*, they prove the greatest witnesses against you; as will appear in this debate, if we first examine the citations you produce, and then shew how fully and clearly these very persons whom you have picked out of all the *Chorus*, do deliver themselves against you. The first citation is that known one, out of *Irenæus*.

us, concerning those barbarous nations who believed without the *Scriptures*, adhering to the *Tradition of the Apostles*, having *salvation* written without *Paper and Ink*.

But what is it you would hence infer, I cannot imagine, unless it be one of these two things; 1. That if we had no *Scriptures* left us, it would be necessary for us to believe on the account of *Apostolical Tradition*; that is, that the grounds of our Faith were so clear and evident of themselves, that tho' they had never been written, yet if they had been conveyed by an unquestionable *Tradition* from the *Apostles*, there had lain an obligation on us

B b

to

§. 18.

Iren. l. 3.
c. 4.

Quid autem, si neque Apostoli quidem scripturas reliquissent nobis, nonne oportebat ordinem sequi traditionis, quam tradiderunt iis quibus committebant Ecclesias? Cui ordinationi assentiunt multa gentes barbarorum, qui in Christum credunt, sine charta & atramento scriptam habentes salutem, & veterem traditionem custodientes.

Quicquid Servator de suis factis & dictis nos legere voluit, hoc scribendum illis tanquam suis manibus imperavit. De Consens. Evang. l. 1. c. ult.

to believe the *Doctrine of Christ*. But, is this our case? hath not God infinitely better provided for us, when (as your other witness S. Augustine speaks) *Whatever our Saviour would have us read of his actions or speeches, he commanded his Apostles and Disciples as his hands to write.* Christian Religion is now no *Cabbala* to us. God hath con-

signed his will over to us, by *Codicils* of his own appointing; and must we then be now in the like case, as if his Will had never been written at all?

2. But what if the *barbarous Nations* did believe without the *Books of Scripture*; what doth that prove, but only this; that there may be sufficient reason to believe in *Christ* where the *Scriptures* are not known? Is that contrary to us who say, *The last resolution of Faith* is into the *Doctrine of Christ* as attested by *God*: now if that *attestation* be sufficiently conveyed, there is an obligation to believe; but withal we say, that to us who enjoy the *Scriptures* as delivered down to us, the only certain and infallible conveyance of *God's Word* to us is by them. So that the whole *Christian World* is obliged to you for your civil comparison of them, with those *Barbarians* who either enjoyed not the *Scriptures*, or in probability were not able to make use of them, as being probably ignorant of the *use of letters*. 3. Doth *Irenæus* in these words say, that even these *Barbarians* did believe upon the *Infallible Testimony* of the *present Church*? No; he mentions no such thing, but that they believed that *Tradition of Doctrine* which was delivered them from the *Apostles*. I ask you then; Suppose at that time some *honest but fallible persons* should have gone into *Scythia*, or some such *barbarous places*, and delivered the *Doctrine of the Gospel*, and attesting the *matter of fact* as being *eye-witnesses of Christ's Miracles, Death, and Resurrection*, whether would these *Barbarians* have been bound to believe or no? If not, then for all I know, *Infidelity* is a very excusable sin; If they were, I pray tell me what it was their *Faith* was resolved into; was it an infallible testimony of fallible Men? And the same case is, of such who should preach the same *Doctrine* from these *eye-witnesses* in another *Generation*, and so on: for although there might be no reason to question their testimony, yet I suppose you will not say, It is *Infallible*? so that still this makes nothing for your purpose. 4. Who better understood *Irenæus* his mind, than him-

Non per alios dispositionem salutis nostræ cognovimus, quam per eos, per quos evangelium pervenit ad nos; quod quidem tunc præconiauerunt, postea verò per Dei voluntatem in Scripturis nobis tradiderunt, fundamentum & columnam fidei nostræ futurum. Iren. l. 3. cap. 1.

self? let us therefore see what he elsewhere tells us is the *foundation and pillar of our Faith* who have received the *Scriptures*. Doth not he tell us, but three Chapters before this, *That we have received the method or Doctrine of our Salvation, from those persons who preached it; which by God's command they after delivered in the Scriptures, which were to be the foundation and pil-*

lar of our Faith? Could any thing be more fully spoken to our purpose than this is? Whereby he shews us, now the *Scriptures* are consigned unto us, what that is which our Faith must stand upon: not the *Infallibility* of the *Church*, but that *Word of God* which is delivered to us. This therefore he elsewhere calls the *Unmovable Canon of our Faith*, as S. Augustine calls it *Divinam*

Irenæus lib. 4. cap. 69. Augustin 2. cont. Donat. cap. 7.

stateram, the Divine Balance we must weigh the grounds of our Belief in.

By which we may guess, what little relief you are like to have from your second witness S. Augustine. Two citations you produce out of him; and, I question not, but to make it appear, that neither of those Testimonies do make for you; and those wery Books afford us sufficient against you.

The

The first is out of his *Book of Christian Doctrine*, which lest we should think not pertinent, you care not to produce it; but we must *A Man who*

strengthens himself with Faith, Hope, and Charity, and retains them, needs not the Scriptures, but only to instruct others, for by these three, many live without Books in a desert. The meaning is, that he who hath a Principle of Divine Life within him, which discovers it in the exercise of those three Graces, need not so much the external Pre-

cepts, because that inward Principle will cause him to do actions suitable to it; only, for convincing or instructing others, he continually uses the Scriptures; but for themselves, who are in the fury of their Persecution, they have no time to read, who, in imitation of that Piety

they shew'd there, live in remote places, and live in the exercise of their Religion, but in the midst of the fury of their Persecution, that not the Scriptures, but the Tradition of the Church is the Foundation of Faith? Doct. Augustinus supponit, quod si quis habet in se Fidem, Spem, and

Charitatem, sine Scripturis, non potest vivere. *Quod si quis habet in se Fidem, Spem, and Charitatem, sine Scripturis, non potest vivere.* when in the preceding paper he had said, *that he who hath a Principle of Divine Life within him, which discovers it in the exercise of those three Graces, need not so much the external Precepts, because that inward Principle will cause him to do actions suitable to it;*

expression concerning *the Authority of the Scriptures*, and *the Authority of the Church*, doth not this imply, that he stands on the Authority of the Scriptures as the proper foundation? But it is reasonable, if the very design of all that Treatise did not force us to call your Pre-

tensions, no nothing can do it more effectually, than to shew, how possibly persuade any reasonable Man to think, that St. Augustine dissent of any such thing, as the *Infallible Testimony* of the present Church to be the ground of Faith,

who when he purposely discourseth concerning the Christian Doctrine, the Principles of it, and the best means to understand it, never so much as mentions any such thing; but on the contrary directs to other but those you call *Moral and Fallible*.

For understanding the Principles of Christian Doctrine, he shew'd several manner of things, some to be enjoyed, some to be used, and others both. The first thing we are to enjoy is God, and therefore begins with him, in whom our happiness lies, and then shew'd the means to come to the enjoyment of God, by explaining the Principles of Faith and the efficacy of it. In his second Book, he shew'd how we may come to the use of Scripture, and first discovers the nature of signs which represent things, and of letters which are signs of words;

and since there are diversities of signs, how necessary the translation of Scripture is into their own language, for you so justify your Bibles and Prayers in an unknown language with; and then shew'd what great reason there was, why there should be some *divine and obscure* places left in Scripture, to conquer our Pride, and to shew, that we are to have the understanding from man, which is commonly slighted things that are of great use.

Then shew'd what preparation and disposition is requisite for Divine Wisdom, and so comes to the use of Scripture, and first discovers the nature of signs which represent things, and of letters which are signs of words; and since there are diversities of signs, how necessary the translation of Scripture is into their own language, for you so justify your Bibles and Prayers in an unknown language with; and then shew'd what great reason there was, why there should be some *divine and obscure* places left in Scripture, to conquer our Pride, and to shew, that we are to have the understanding from man, which is commonly slighted things that are of great use.

Then shew'd what preparation and disposition is requisite for Divine Wisdom, and so comes to the use of Scripture, and first discovers the nature of signs which represent things, and of letters which are signs of words; and since there are diversities of signs, how necessary the translation of Scripture is into their own language, for you so justify your Bibles and Prayers in an unknown language with; and then shew'd what great reason there was, why there should be some *divine and obscure* places left in Scripture, to conquer our Pride, and to shew, that we are to have the understanding from man, which is commonly slighted things that are of great use.

Then shew'd what preparation and disposition is requisite for Divine Wisdom, and so comes to the use of Scripture, and first discovers the nature of signs which represent things, and of letters which are signs of words; and since there are diversities of signs, how necessary the translation of Scripture is into their own language, for you so justify your Bibles and Prayers in an unknown language with; and then shew'd what great reason there was, why there should be some *divine and obscure* places left in Scripture, to conquer our Pride, and to shew, that we are to have the understanding from man, which is commonly slighted things that are of great use.

Non itaq; fide, spe, & caritate subnixus, non indiget scripturis nisi ad alios instruendos. Itaq; multi per hoc rite, etiam in solitudine sine codicibus vivunt. De Vita Christiana, l. 1. cap. 39.

Quidam dicunt, quod si quis habet in se Fidem, Spem, and Charitatem, sine Scripturis, non potest vivere. De Doctr. Christiana, l. 1. cap. 38.

Ad edendum labori superbiam, & intellectum suum revocandum, cui facile invidiamus, plerumq; vilescunt, l. 2. c. 6.

In Canonicis autem scripturis ecclesiarum catholicarum quamplurimum auctoritatem sequatur, inter quas sane illa sunt, qua Apostolicas se habere, & epistolas accipere meruerunt, l. 2. c. 8.

Quicquid Servator de suis factis & dictis nos legere voluit, hoc scribendum illis tanquam suis manibus imperavit. De Consens. Evang. l. 1. c. ult.

to believe the *Doctrine of Christ*. But, is this our case? hath not God infinitely better provided for us, when (as your other witness S. Augustine speaks) *Whatever our Saviour would have us read of his actions or speeches, he commanded his Apostles and Disciples as his hands to write.* Christian Religion is now no *Cabbala* to us. God hath con-

signed his will over to us, by *Codicils* of his own appointing; and must we then be now in the like case, as if his Will had never been written at all?

2. But what if the *barbarous Nations* did believe without the *Books of Scripture*; what doth that prove, but only this; that there may be sufficient reason to believe in *Christ* where the *Scriptures* are not known? Is that contrary to us who say, *The last resolution of Faith* is into the *Doctrine of Christ* as attested by God: now if that *attestation* be sufficiently conveyed, there is an obligation to believe; but withal we say, that to us who enjoy the *Scriptures* as delivered down to us, the only certain and infallible conveyance of God's Word to us is by them. So that the whole *Christian World* is obliged to you for your civil comparison of them, with those *Barbarians* who either enjoyed not the *Scriptures*, or in probability were not able to make use of them, as being probably ignorant of the *use of letters*. 3. Doth *Irenæus* in these words say, that even these *Barbarians* did believe upon the *Infallible Testimony* of the *present Church*? No; he mentions no such thing, but that they believed that *Tradition of Doctrine* which was delivered them from the *Apostles*. I ask you then; Suppose at that time some *honest* but *fallible persons* should have gone into *Scythia*, or some such *barbarous places*, and delivered the *Doctrine of the Gospel*, and attesting the *matter of fact* as being *eye-witnesses of Christ's Miracles, Death, and Resurrection*, whether would these *Barbarians* have been bound to believe or no? If not, then for all I know, *Infidelity* is a very excusable sin; If they were, I pray tell me what it was their *Faith* was resolved into; was it an infallible testimony of fallible Men? And the same case is, of such who should preach the same *Doctrine* from these *eye-witnesses* in another *Generation*, and so on: for although there might be no reason to question their testimony, yet I suppose you will not say, It is *Infallible*? so that still this makes nothing for your purpose. 4. Who better understood *Irenæus* his mind, than him-

Non per alios dispositionem salutis nostræ cognovimus, quam per eos, per quos evangelium pervenit ad nos; quod quidem tunc præconiauerunt, postea verò per Dei voluntatem in Scripturis nobis tradiderunt, fundamentum & columnam fidei nostræ futurum. Iren. l. 3. cap. 1.

self? let us therefore see what he elsewhere tells us is the *foundation and pillar of our Faith who have received the Scriptures*. Doth not he tell us, but three Chapters before this, *That we have received the method or Doctrine of our Salvation, from those persons who preached it; which by God's command they after delivered in the Scriptures, which were to be the foundation and pil-*

lar of our Faith? Could any thing be more fully spoken to our purpose than this is? Whereby he shews us, now the *Scriptures* are consigned unto us, what that is which our Faith must stand upon: not the *Infallibility* of

Irenæus lib. 4. cap. 69. Augustin 2. cont. Donat. cap. 7.

the *Church*, but that *Word of God* which is delivered to us. This therefore he elsewhere calls the *Unmovable Canon of our Faith*, as S. Augustine calls it *Divinam stateram, the Divine Balance* we must weigh the grounds of our Belief in.

By which we may guess, what little relief you are like to have from your second witness S. Augustine. Two citations you produce out of him; and, I question not, but to make it appear, that neither of those Testimonies do make for you; and those wery Books afford us sufficient against you.

The

The first is out of his *Books of Christian Doctrine*, which lest we should think not pertinent, you care not to produce it; but we must *A Man who strengthens himself with Faith, Hope, and Charity, and retains them unshaken, needs not the Scriptures, but only to instruct others, for by these three, many live without Books in a desert.* His meaning is, that he who hath a Principle of Divine Life within him, which discovers it self in the exercise of those three Graces, needs not so much the external Precepts, because that inward Principle will carry him to actions suitable to it; only, for convincing or instructing others, these Books are continually useful; but for themselves, those good Men who first through the fury of their Persecution were driven, and after others, who, in imitation of that Piety they shewed there, did withdraw into remote places, did live in the exercise of their Religion without them. But what is there in all this to infer, that not the Scriptures but the Infallibility of the Church is the Foundation of Faith? Doth St. Augustine suppose that Men may have Faith, Hope, and Charity, without believing? Or, that Men may believe without the Scriptures, when in the precedent Chapter he hath this remarkable expression concerning Faith, *That it will soon stumble, if the Authority of the sacred Scriptures be weakened*: And doth not this imply that Faith stands on the Authority of the Scriptures as its proper foundation? But this were pardonable, if the very design of all that Treatise did not so evidently refute all your Pretensions, as nothing can do it more effectually. For can you possibly persuade any reasonable Man to think, that St. Augustine dreamt of any such thing, as the *Infallible Testimony* of the present Church to be the ground of Faith, who when he purposely discourseth concerning the *Christian Doctrine*, the Principles of it, and the best means to understand it, never so much as mentions any such thing; but on the contrary directs to no other but those you call *Moral and Fallible Means*? For understanding the Principles of *Christian Doctrine*, he shews us the several natures of things, some to be enjoyed, some to be used, and others both: That the main thing we are to enjoy is God, and therefore begins with him as our last end in whom our happiness lies, and then shews the means to come to this enjoyment of God, by explaining the Principles of Faith and the efficacy of it. In his second Book, he shews how we may come to the sense of Scripture, and first discovers the nature of signs which represent things, and of letters which are signs of words, and since there are diversities of tongues, how necessary the translation of Scripture is into them (a good citation for you to justify your Bibles and Prayers in an unknown language with) and then shews what great reason there was, why there should be some doubtful and obscure places left in Scripture, *to conquer our Pride by Industry, and to keep the understanding from nauseating, which commonly slight things that are easily understood.* Then shews what preparation and disposition of Soul is requisite for Divine Wisdom, and so comes to the understanding the Scriptures: For which, first is requisite a serious and diligent reading of them; in order to which he must carefully distinguish such as are Canonical from such as are not, and for judging of these, he never so much as mentions, much less sends us to the *Infallible Testimony of the Roman Church*, but bids us follow the Authority of the most Catholick Churches among which those are, which are worthy to be call'd Apostolical Sees, and had Epistles sent to them. What Authority then had

Homo itaq; fide, spe, & charitate subnixus, incommutabilem retinens, non indiget scripturis nisi ad alios instruendos. Itaq; multi per hac via, etiam in solitudine sine codicibus vivunt. De Doctr. Christiana. l. 1. cap. 39.

Titubabit autem fides, si divinarum scripturarum vacillat auctoritas. De Doctr. Christi. l. 1. c. 38.

Ad edomandam labore superbiam, & intellectum a fastidio revocandum, cui facile investigata plerumq; vilescunt, l. 2. c. 6.

In Canonicis autem scripturis ecclesiarum catholicarum quamplurimum auctoritatem sequatur, inter quas sane illa sunt, quae Apostolicas sedes habere, & epistolas accipere meruerunt. 2. c. 8.

the Church of Rome to judge of Canonical Scriptures, more than *Ephesus*, *Philippi*, *Theſſalonica*, &c. To be ſure then, *St. Auguſtine* was not of our Diſcourſer's mind, as to the judgment of Canonical Books: And why ſhould he ſend Men to thoſe Churches which received the *Epistles*, but that there they were like to meet with greater ſatisfaction as to the authenticalneſs of the Copies of thoſe *Epistles*? After this, he gives directions for underſtanding

In illi enim quæ aperiæ poſita in Scripturâ ſunt, inveniuntur illa omnia, quæ continent fidem, moreſq; vivendi. l. 2. c. 9.

hard places, *Fiſt by diligent reading and remembring the plainest places; for in them (ſaith he) are found all thoſe things which contain matters of Faith and Practice.*

An excellent citation for your ſeveral purpoſes, eſpecially when you would prove the *Obſcurity of Scripture*, the *neceſſity of an Infallible Judge*, or your *Doctrines of Fundamentals* out of *St. Auguſtine*. And then bids them compare obſcure and eaſie places together, to underſtand the *proprieties of words*, to get knowledge in the *Tongues*, to compare *Versions*, *Antecedents* and *Conſequents*, to be ſkill'd in all humane Arts and Sciences; theſe and ſeveral other inſtructions to the ſame purpoſe are the ſcope of his following Book. Would any one now but *T.C.* have ventured ſo unluckily upon this Treatiſe of *St. Auguſtine* above all others, to prove the *Infallibility* of the Churches *Teſtimony* as neceſſary to *Faith* by? Could any *Proteſtant* have delivered his mind more punctually and plainly than he doth? And can you, or any one elſe that doth but look into that Book, imagine that *St. Auguſtine* ever imagined, that any ſuch thing ſhould ever be thought of in the World, as that the *Teſtimony* of the Church of Rome muſt be owned as the *Infallible Foundation of Faith*, and the *Infallible Interpreter of Scripture*? But this it is, to converſe with the *Fathers* only by *retail*, as they are delivered out in *parcels* to you with *directions* upon them, what *uſe* they are for, by *Bellarmino* and ſuch Artiſts as himſelf. This is, inſtead of *quoting* the *Fathers*, to *challenge* them; and you ſee they are not afraid to appear, though to your Shame and Confuſion.

But for all this you have a reſerve in *St. Auguſtine* ſtill: Let us ſee what quotation that is, which lies ſo in *Ambuſcado* behind the Hedges, and is ſo loth to come out. There is good reaſon for ſo much *reſervedneſs*; for when we come to ſearch, we find only *Buſhes* inſtead of *Souldiers*. I have thoroughly examined the place you refer us to, and cannot meet any thing the leaſt pertinent to your purpoſe, unleſs the queſtion of the *lawfulneſs of Hereticks Baptiſm*, prove your Churches *Teſtimony* to be *Infallible*. But it may be, it is but a venial miſtake of a Chapter or two, forward or backward, and there we may find it. Which when I look into, I cannot but ſuſpect that ſome *Proteſtant* had *trapped* you into this Book and place of *St. Auguſtine*; there being ſcarce any Book or place in him more begirt with Arguments againſt you than this is. I was at firſt fearful you had quoted *Fathers* at a *peradventure*; but upon my further conſidering the place, I ſoon rectified that miſtake. I will therefore reckon you up ſome of the moſt probable Citations out of *St. Auguſtine's* Books of *Baptiſm againſt the Donatiſts*, and chooſe which of them you pleaſe to prove the neceſſity of an *Infallible Teſtimony* of the *preſent Church* as a foundation of Faith by? I ſuppoſe, that you intended is

De Baptiſm. c. Donatiſt. l. 5. c. 24.

Quod autem nos admonet, ut ad fontem recurreamus, i. e. ad Apoſtolicam traditionem, & inde canalem in noſtra tempora dirigamus, optimum eſt, & ſine dubitatione faciendum, l. 5. c. 26.

in the next Chapter but one following, where *St. Auguſtine* cites that paſſage of *Cyprian*, *That we ought to recur to the Fountain, i. e. to Apoſtolic Tradition, and thence derive the channel into our own times; this, ſaith St. Auguſtine, is the beſt, and without doubt to be done.* No

doubt, you think you owe me great thanks for finding out ſo appoſite a place for you, ſo near that you intended; but, before we have done with it, you will

will see what little reason you have to thank me for it: The place you see is cited by St. Augustine out of Cyprian, in whose Epistle it is, to Pompeius Cyp. ep. against Stephanus Bishop of Rome: We therefore consider, that it was Stephen 74 who pleaded Custom and Tradition, to which Cyprian replies, *Whence comes this Tradition, doth it descend from the Lord's Authority, or from the Commands and Epistles of the Apostles, for those things are to be done which are there written?* And again, *If it be commanded in the Gospel, or the Epistles, and Acts of the Apostles, then let this holy Tradition be observed.* We see then what

Unde traditio hac, utrumne de Dominica autoritate descendens, an de Apostolorum mandatis & epistolis veniens? Ea enim esse facienda quæ scripta sunt testatur, &c. Si in Evangelio præcipitur, aut in Apostolorum epistolis aut Actibus invenitur, observetur etiam sancta hæc traditio.

St. Cyprian meant by his Apostolical Tradition, not one Infallibly attested by the present Church, but that is clearly derived from Scripture as its fountain: And therefore brings in the foregoing words on purpose to correct the Errors of Traditions, that, *As when Channels are diverted to a wrong course, we must have recourse to the fountain; so we must in all pretended Traditions of the Church, run up to the Scriptures as the Fountain-head.* And whereas Bellarmine's only shift to avoid this place of Cyprian, is, by saying that Cyprian argued *more errantium*, i. e. could not defend one error but by another; see how different the judgments of St. Augustine and Bellarmine are about it: for St. Augustine is so far from blaming it in him, that he saith, *Optimum est & sine dubitatione faciendum*, i. e. *It was the best and most prudent course to*

Proinde, inquit, frustra quidam qui ratione vincuntur, Consuetudinem nobis obijciunt, quasi consuetudo major sit veritate; aut non id sit in spiritualibus sequendum quod in melius fuerit à Spiritu Sancto revelatum. Hoc planè verum est, quia ratio & veritas consuetudini præponenda est. Aug. de baptis. c. Donat. l. 4. c. 5.

prevent errors. And in another place where he mentions that saying of Cyprian, *It is in vain for them to object Custom, who are overcome by Reason, as though Custom were greater than Truth; or as though that were not to be followed in spiritual things, which is revealed by the Holy Ghost.* This saith St. Augustine, *is evidently true, because Reason and Truth is to be preferred before Custom.* He doth not charge these sayings on him as Bellarmine doth, as part of his Errors, but acknowledgeth them, and disputes against his opinion out of those Principles. And when before, the Donatists objected the Authority of St. Cyprian in the point of Rebaptization, What kind of answer doth St. Augustine give them? The very same that any Protestant would give. *Who knows not that the sacred canonical Scripture of the Old and New Testament is contained within certain bounds; and ought so far to be prefer'd before the succeeding Writings of Bishops, that of that alone we are not to doubt or call in question any thing therein written, whether it be true and right or no.* But,

Quis autem nesciat Sanctam Scripturam Canonicam, tam Veteris quam Novi Testamenti certis suis terminis contineri, eamque omnibus posterioribus Episcoporum literis ita præponi, ut de illa omnino dubitari & disceptari non possit, utrum verum, vel utrum rectum sit, quicquid in ea scriptum esse constiterit, l. 2. de bapt. c. Donat. cap. 3.

as he saith in the following words, *All the Writings since the confirmation of the Canons of Scripture are liable to dispute, and even Councils themselves to be examined and amended by Councils.* Think you then, that St. Augustine ever thought of a present Infallibility in the Church? Or, if he did, he expressed it in as odd a manner as ever I read: How easily might he have stopt the mouths of the Donatists with that one pretence of Infallibility? How impertinently doth he dispute through all those Books, if he had believed any such thing? It were easie to multiply the Citations out of other Books of St. Austin, to shew how much he attributed to Scripture, as the only Rule of Faith; and consequently, how far from believing your Doctrine of Infallibility. But these may suffice to shew, how unhappily you light on these Books of St. Augustine for the proof of your Opinion out of the Fathers.

The last thing your Discourser objects against his Lordship's way, is, *If* §. 18.
the

the Church be fallible in the Tradition of Scripture, how can I ever be infallibly certain, that she hath not erred de facto, and defined some Book to be the Word of God, which really is not his Word? To which I answer. If you mean by *Infallible Certainty*, such a certainty as must have some *Infallible Testimony* for the ground of it, you beg the Question: For I deny any such *Infallible Testimony* to be at all requisite for our believing the Canon of Scripture, and therefore you object that as an inconvenience, which I apprehend to be none at all. For I do not think it any absurdity to say, that I cannot believe upon some *Infallible Testimony*, that the Church hath not erred in defining the Canon of Scripture. If by *Infallible Certainty* you mean such a Certainty as absolutely excludes a possibility of Deception; you would do well, first to shew how congruous this is to humane Nature in this present state, before you make such a certainty so necessary for any act of humane Understanding. But, if by *infallible certainty* you mean only such as excludes all possibility of reasonable doubting upon the consideration of the validity and sufficiency of that Testimony I am to believe the Canon of Scripture upon; then I assert, that upon making the Churches Testimony to be fallible, it doth not at all follow, but that I may have so great a certainty as excludes the possibility of all reasonable doubting concerning the Canon of Scripture. For when I suppose the Churches Testimony fallible, I do not thereby understand, as though there were as great reason to suspect her deceived, as not, (nay, I say there can be no reason to suspect her deceived) but by that I understand only this, that the Church hath not any *supernatural Infallibility* given her in delivering such a Testimony, or that such *Infallibility* must be the foundation of believing the thing so delivered. For whether I suppose your particular Church of Rome, or the Catholick Church to be *supernaturally Infallible* in her Traditions, there will be the same difficulty returning, and an equal impossibility of vindicating our Faith from the Entanglements of a Circle. For still the question unavoidably returns, from whence I believe such a *supernatural Infallibility* in the Church? For in that it is *supernatural*, it must suppose some promise on which it depends, that promise must be somewhere extant, and that can be no where but in Scripture; therefore when I am asked, Why I believe the Canon of the Scripture to be true; if I answer, Because the Tradition of the Catholick Church is *Infallible*, the question presently returns, Since humane nature is in it self fallible, whence comes the Church to have this *Infallibility*? If I answer, By the assistance of God's Spirit, I am presently asked, Since no Man by the light of nature and meer reason can be assured of this; how know you that you are not deceived in believing such an assistance? If to this I answer, Because God who is *Infallible* hath made this Promise in his Word, I am driven again to the first question, How I know this to be God's Word, and must answer it as before. Upon the *Infallible Testimony of the Catholick Church*. Thus we see, how impossible it is to avoid a Circle in the supposition of a *supernatural Infallibility* in the Churches Tradition. But, if no more be meant but a kind of *rational Infallibility*, (though those Terms be not very proper) i. e. so great evidence, as, if I question it, I may, upon equal grounds, question every thing which Mankind yields the firmest Assent to, because I cannot imagine, that so great a part of the wisest, and most considerative part of the World should be so grossly deceived in a matter of such moment (especially supposing a Divine Providence) then I freely and heartily assert, We have such a kind of *rational Infallibility*; or rather the highest degree of actual Certainty concerning the Truth of the Canon of Scripture; and that the Catholick Church hath

hath not de facto erred in defining it. Thus I have followed your discour-
sing Christian through all his doubts and perplexities, and upon the result,
can find no ground at all either of doubting concerning the *Scripture*, or of
believing the Testimony of your *Church*, or any, to be an *infallible ground*
of Faith. Your next passage is, to tell us *how his Lordships Dedalian wind-*
ings (as you finely call them) *are disintricated*: A happy Man you are at P. 73.
squaring Circles, and getting out of *Labyrinths*. And thus it appears in
the present case. For when his Lordship had said, *That the Tradition of*
the Church is too weak, because that is not absolutely Divine; you repeat over
your already exploded Proposition, that there may be an *infallible Testimony*
which is not absolutely Divine; which, when I have your faculty of writ-
ing things, which neither you nor any one else can understand, I may ad-
mit of; but till then, I must humbly beg your pardon, as not being able to
assent to any thing which I cannot understand, and have no reason to be-
lieve. And withal, contrary to your second Answer, it appears, *That if*
the Testimony of the Primitive, were absolutely Divine, because infallible, the
Testimony of the present Church, must be absolutely Divine, if it be infal-
lible.

The rest of this Chapter is spent in the examining some bye citations of S. 19.
Men of your own side chiefly, and therefore it is very little material as to
the truth or falshood of the present Controversie; yet, because you seem to
triumph so much as soon as you are off the main business, I shall briefly
return an Answer to the substance of what you say. His Lordship having
asserted *the Tradition of the Primitive Apostolical Church to be Divine*, and that P. 81. n.
the Church of England doth embrace that as much as any Church whatsoever, 20.
withal adds, *That when S. Augustine said, I would not*

believe the Gospel, unless the Authority of the Catholick Ego vero Evangelio non crederem, nisi me
Church moved me; some of your own will not endure it Catholica Ecclesia commoveret autoritas.
should be understood, save of the Church in the time of Aug. l. 1. c. ep. fund. c. 5.

the Apostles only; and some, of the Church in general, not excluding after Ages:
but sure to include Christ and his Apostles. In your Answer to this, you insult
strangely over his Lordship in two things, First, *That he should say Some, and*
mention but one in his Margent. 2. *That that One doth not say, what he cites* Ibid. n. 7.
out of him. To the first I answer, you might easily observe, the use his Lord-
ship makes of his Margent, is not so much to bring clear and distinct proofs
of what he writes in his Book, but what hath some reference to what he
there says: and therefore it was no absurdity for him to say in his Book in-
definitely *some*, and yet in his Margent only to mention *Occham*. For, when
his Lordship writ that, no doubt his mind was upon *others*, who asserted
the same thing, tho' he did not load his Margent with them. And, that
you may see, I have reason for what I say, I hope you will not suppose his
Lordship unacquainted with the *Testimonies* of those of your side, who do
in terms assert this. That I may therefore free you from all kind of suspi-
cion; What think you of *Gerson*, when, speaking of the greater Authority
of the *Primitive Church* than of the present: he adds,

And by this means we come to understand, what S. Au- Et sic aperitur modus intelligendi illud Au-
gustine said, I would not believe the Gospel, &c. For gustini, Evangelio non crederem, nisi me au-
there, saith he, he takes the Church for the Primitive Con- thoritas Ecclesia compulisset. Ibidem enim
gregation of Believers, who saw and heard Christ, and Ecclesiam sumit, pro primitiva congregatio-
were witnesses of what he did. Is not this Testimony ne fidelium eorum, qui Christum viderunt,
plain enough for you? But, besides this, we have ano- audierunt, & sui testes fuerunt. Gerson.
ther as evident, in whom are those very words, which his Lordship by a lect. 2. de vita spirituali an Coroll. 7.
lapse

the Church be fallible in the Tradition of Scripture, how can I ever be infallibly certain, that she hath not erred in fact, and defined some Book to be the Word of God, which really is not his Word? To which I answer. If you mean by *Infallible Certainty*, such a certainty as must have some *Infallible Testimony* for the ground of it, you beg the Question: For I deny any such *Infallible Testimony* to be at all requisite for our believing the Canon of Scripture, and therefore you object that as an inconvenience, which I apprehend to be none at all. For I do not think it any absurdity to say that I cannot believe upon some *Infallible Testimony*, that the Church hath not erred in defining the Canon of Scripture. If by *Infallible Certainty* you mean such a Certainty as absolutely excludes a possibility of Deception; you would do well, first to shew how congruous this is to humane Nature in the present State, before you make such a certainty so necessary for any sort of understanding. But, if by *infallible certainty* you mean only such as excludes all possibility of reasonable doubting upon the consideration of the evidence and sufficiency of that Testimony I am to believe the Canon of Scripture upon; then I assert, that upon making the Churches Testimony to be fallible, it does not at all follow, but that I may have to great a certainty as excludes the possibility of all reasonable doubting concerning the Canon of Scripture. For when I suppose the Churches Testimony fallible, I do not suppose, as though there were as great reason to suspect her deceived, as not, (nay, I say there can be no reason to suspect her deceived) but by that I understand only this, that the Church hath not any *supernatural Infallibility* when her in delivering such a Testimony, or that such *Infallibility* must be the foundation of believing the thing so delivered. For whether I suppose your particular Church of Rome, or the Catholick Church to be *supernaturally Infallible* in her Traditions, there will be the same difficulty remaining, and an equal impossibility of vindicating our Faith from the entanglements of a Circle. For still the question unavoidably returns, from whence I believe such a *supernatural Infallibility* in the Church? For in that it is *supernatural*, I must suppose some promise on which it depends, that promise must be somewhere extant, and that can be no where but in Scripture. Therefore when I am asked, Why I believe the Canon of the Scripture to be true, I answer, Because the Tradition of the Catholick Church is *Infallible*, the question presently returns, Since humane nature is in it self fallible, whence comes the Church to have this *Infallibility*? If I answer, By the assistance of God's spirit, I am presently asked, Since no Man by the light of nature and meer reason can be assured of this; how know you that you are not deceived in believing such an assistance? If to this I answer, Because God who is *Infallible* hath made this Promise in his Word, I am driven again to the first question, How I know this to be God's Word, and must answer it as before, Upon the *Infallible Testimony of the Catholick Church*. Thus we see, how impossible it is to avoid a Circle in the supposition of a *supernatural Infallibility* in the Churches Tradition. But, if no more be meant but a kind of *rational Infallibility*, (though those Terms be not very proper) i. e. so great evidence, as, if I question it, I may, upon equal grounds, question every thing which Mankind yields the *firmest Assent* to, because I cannot imagine, that so great a part of the wisest, and most considerative part of the World should be so grossly deceived in a matter of such moment (especially supposing a *Divine Providence*) then I freely and heartily assert, We have such a kind of *rational Infallibility*; or rather the highest degree of *actual Certainty* concerning the Truth of the Canon of Scripture; and that the Catholick Church hath

hath not de facto erred in defining it. Thus I have followed your discour-
sing Christian through all his doubts and perplexities, and upon the result,
can find no ground at all either of doubting concerning the *Scripture*, or of
believing the Testimony of your *Church*, or any, to be an *infallible ground*
of Faith. Your next passage is, to tell us *how his Lordships Dedalian wind-*
ings (as you finely call them) *are disintricated*: A happy Man you are at P. 78.
squaring Circles, and getting out of *Labyrinths*. And thus it appears in
the present case. For when his Lordship had said, *That the Tradition of*
the Church is too weak, because that is not absolutely Divine; you repeat over
your already exploded Proposition, that there may be an *infallible Testimony*
which is not absolutely Divine; which, when I have your faculty of writ-
ting things, which neither you nor any one else can understand, I may ad-
mit of; but till then, I must humbly beg your pardon, as not being able to
assent to any thing which I cannot understand, and have no reason to be-
lieve. And withal, contrary to your second Answer, it appears, *That if*
the Testimony of the Primitive, were absolutely Divine, because infallible, the
Testimony of the present Church, must be absolutely Divine, if it be infal-
lible.

The rest of this Chapter is spent in the examining some bye citations of S. 19.
Men of your own side chiefly, and therefore it is very little material as to
the truth or falshood of the present Controversie; yet, because you seem to
triumph so much as soon as you are off the main business, I shall briefly
return an Answer to the substance of what you say. His Lordship having
asserted *the Tradition of the Primitive Apostolical Church to be Divine, and that* P. 81. n.
the Church of England doth embrace that as much as any Church whatsoever, 20.
withal adds, *That when S. Augustine said, I would not*

believe the Gospel, unless the Authority of the Catholick Ego vero Evangelio non crederem, nisi me
Church moved me; some of your own will not endure it Catholica Ecclesia commoveret auctoritas.
should be understood, save of the Church in the time of Aug. l. i. c. ep. fund. c. 5.

the Apostles only; and some, of the Church in general, not excluding after Ages:
but sure to include Christ and his Apostles. In your Answer to this, you insult
strangely over his Lordship in two things, *First, That he should say Some, and*
mention but one in his Margent. 2. *That that One doth not say, what he cites*
out of him. To the first I answer, you might easily observe, the use his Lord- Ibid. n. 7.
ship makes of his Margent, is not so much to bring clear and distinct proofs
of what he writes in his Book, but what hath some reference to what he
there says: and therefore it was no absurdity for him to say in his Book in-
definitely *some*, and yet in his Margent only to mention *Occham*. For, when
his Lordship writ that, no doubt his mind was upon *others*, who asserted
the same thing, tho' he did not load his Margent with them. And, that
you may see, I have reason for what I say, I hope you will not suppose his
Lordship unacquainted with the Testimonies of those of your side, who do
in terms assert this. That I may therefore free you from all kind of suspi-
cion; What think you of Gerson, when, speaking of the greater Authority
of the *Primitive Church than of the present*: he adds,

And by this means we come to understand, what S. Au- Et sic aperitur modus intelligendi illud Au-
gustine said, I would not believe the Gospel, &c. For gustini, Evangelio non crederem, nisi me au-
there, saith he, he takes the Church for the Primitive Con- thoritas Ecclesie compulisset. Ibidem enim
gregation of Believers, who saw and heard Christ, and Ecclesiam sumit, pro primitiva congregatio-
were witnesses of what he did. Is not this Testimony ne fidelium eorum, qui Christum viderunt;
plain enough for you? But, besides this, we have ano- audierunt, & sui testes fuerunt. Gerson:
ther as evident, in whom are those very words, which his Lordship by a
lapse

lapse of memory, attributes to *Occham*: For *Durandus* plainly says, That

Hoc autem quod dictum est de approbatione Scripturae per Ecclesiam, intelligitur solum de Ecclesia qua fuit tempore Apostolorum, qui fuerunt repleti Spiritu Sancto, & nihilominus viderunt miracula Christi & audierunt ejus Doctrinam, & ob hoc fuerunt convenientes testes omnium qua Christus fecit aut docuit, ut per eorum testimonium Scriptura, continens facta & dicta Christi, approbaretur. Durand. l. 3. dist. 24. q. 1. sect. 9.

for what concerns the approbation of Scripture by the Church, it is understood only of the Church which was in the Apostles times, who were filled with the Holy Spirit, and withal, saw the Miracle of Christ, and heard his Doctrine; and on that account were convenient witnesses of all which Christ did, or taught, that by their Testimony, the Scripture containing the actions and speeches of Christ, might receive approbation. Do you yet desire a Testimony

more expresse and full, than this is, of one who doth

understand the Church exclusively of all successive to the Apostles, when he had, just before, produced that known Testimony of *S. Augustine*? You see then, the Bishop had some reason to say, Some of your Church asserted this to be *S. Augustine's* meaning; and therefore your Instances of some, where but one is meant, are both impertinent and scurrilous. For, where it is evidently known, there was but one, it were a Solæcism to say some; as to say, that some of the Apostles betrayed Christ, when it is known, that none but Judas did it. But, if I should say, that some Jesuits had writ for the killing of Kings, and in the *Margent* should cite *Mariana*, no person conversant in their writings, would think it a Solæcism; for tho' I produce him for a remarkable Instance, yet that doth not imply, that I have none else to produce, but only that the mentioning of one, might shew I was not without proof of what I said. For your impudent oblique slander on the memory of that excellent Prelate Arch-Bishop Cranmer, when you say, If a Catholick to disgrace the Protestant Primacy of Canterbury, should say, Some of them carried a holy Sister lock'd up in a Chest about with them, and name Cranmer only in the *Margent*; His memory is infinitely above your slyest detractions; and withal, when you are about such a piece of Criticism, I pray, tell me, what doth some of them relate to? Is Primacy the name of some Men? Just as if one should disgrace the See of Rome, and say, Some of them have been Atheists, Magicians, debauched, &c. Tho' I confess, it were a great injury in this case, to cite but one in the *Margent*, unless in pity to the Reader; yet, you may sooner vindicate some of them from a Solæcism in Language, when the See of Rome went before, than any of them from those Solæcisms in manners, which your own Authors have complained of.

P. 79. But, say you, What if this singular-plural say no such thing, as the words alledged by the Bishop signifie? I have already granted it to have been a very venial mistake of memory in his Lordship of *Occham* for *Durandus*, in whom those very words are which are in the *Margent* of his Lordships Book, us appears in the Testimony already produced. I acknowledge therefore, that *Occham* in that place of his Dialogues, doth speak of the Catholick Church of all Ages, comprehending the Apostles and Evangelists in it; and in this sense he saith, that place of *S. Augustine* is to be understood. But, what advantage this is to your cause, I cannot imagine. For, what if the Catholick Church be taken in that comprehensive sense, to include not only the Apostles, but the Church successively from their times? Doth it hence follow, That it is not day tho' the Sun shines? Or rather, Doth it not follow, That you are not so quick-sighted as you would seem to be? And, Whether his Lordship or you come nearer the meaning of *Occham's* words, let any one judge. For they who speak of the Church in that comprehensive sense, do only suppose the Infallibility to have been in the Primitive Apostolical Church, but the successive Church to be only the chanel of conveyance of that Testimony down to us, and so they say no more than we do.

Thus

Thus Driedo expounds that place of S. Augustine ; who understands it of the Catholick Church, which was from the beginning of the Christian Faith, increasing according to the course of succession of Bishops to these times, which Church comprehends in it the College of Apostles. Do you think that these Men did believe a present Infallibility in the Church ? If so, To what end are they

so careful to carry it so high as the Apostles ? Whereas, on your Principle we can have no assurance concerning any thing that the Apostles did or said but only for the Infallibility of the present Church. You must therefore understand the present Church exclusively of the Apostolical Church ; and therefore if S. Augustine be understood in their sense, he is far enough from serving your purposes. But, say you, It is evident, that S. Augustine must speak of the Church in his time, because he speaks of that Church which said to him, *Noli credere Manichæo*, which was not true of the Apostolical Church ? But, Why might not the Apostolical Church be a reason to S. Augustine, not to believe *Manichæus*, because he found no footsteps of his Doctrine in the Records of that Church ? Again, suppose he means the present Church, Doth he mean the infallible Testimony of the present Church ? Might not the Testimony of the Church, supposing it fallible, be sufficient for what S. Augustine saith of it ? I doubt it not : And, you seem to have no great confidence in this Testimony your self, when you add, *That though it be a point of Faith to believe that the Church is infallible, in delivering Scripture to us, yet it is not a point of Faith, that her Infallibility is proved out of the cited place of S. Augustine.* But, when you say, *it is sufficient that it be clear and manifest out of the Text it self*, what text do you mean ? S. Augustine's, or the Scriptures ? If St. Augustine's, you would do well to shew, by what engines you force Infallibility out of his words ; if the Scriptures, What becomes of our good Motives of Credibility ?

When his Lordship objects, *That according to your Principles, the Tradition of the present Church must be as infallible as that of the Primitive*, you very learnedly distinguish, *That if he means, the one must be as truly and really infallible, quoad substantiam, as the other, you grant it : But if he mean, the one must be as highly and perfectly infallible, as the other, quoad modum, you deny it.* Very good still ! It seems there are higher and lower degrees in Infallibility. I pray tell us, what that is which is more than infallible ? The present Church (you say) is infallible, but not so highly and perfectly infallible, therefore there must be degrees in Infallibility ; and since the lowest degree is infallible, that which is highly infallible, must be more than infallible. Again, What difference is there between the substance and the mode in Infallibility ? I had thought, the substance of Infallibility had lain in the mode ; and I should rather think Infallibility it self to be a mode of Apprehension, than talk of substance and modes in it. But, it may be, you mean such kind of modes of Infallibility, as absolute and hypothetical. If you do so, explain your self by them ; and that we may better understand your meaning, shew us whether the Church be at all capable of absolute Infallibility ; if not, What difference there is in degrees between the hypothetical Infallibility of the present and Primitive Church, supposing both infallible in delivering their Testimony, and no otherwise. For you yet again add, *Of the Churches Testimony being infallible, but not simply Divine, but it is the infallible Testimony of a desperate cause, to have but one bad shift, and to use it so often.*

Augustinus cum dicit, ego Evangelio, &c. intelligit de Ecclesia Catholica qua fuit ab initio Christiana fidei, secundum seriem successionis Episcoporum crescens ad hac usque tempora, qua sancta Ecclesia completitur Collegium Apostolorum. Driedo. Tom. 1. l. 4. cap. 4.

S. 20.
P. 81. n. 21.
P. 80.

lapse of memory, attributes to *Occham*: For *Durandus* plainly says, *That*

Hoc autem quod dictum est de approbatione Scripturae per Ecclesiam, intelligitur solum de Ecclesia qua fuit tempore Apostolorum, qui fuerunt repleti Spiritu Sancto, & nihilominus viderunt miracula Christi & audierunt ejus Doctrinam, & ob hoc fuerunt convenientes testes omnium quae Christus fecit aut docuit, ut per eorum testimonium Scriptura, continens facta & dicta Christi, approbaretur. Durand. l. 3. dist. 24. q. 1. lect. 9.

for what concerns the approbation of Scripture by the Church, it is understood only of the Church which was in the Apostles times, who were filled with the Holy Spirit, and withal, saw the Miracle of Christ, and heard his Doctrine; and on that account were convenient witnesses of all which Christ did, or taught, that by their Testimony, the Scripture containing the actions and speeches of Christ, might receive approbation. Do you yet desire a Testimony

more exprefs and full, than this is, of one who doth understand the Church exclusively of all successive to the *Apostles*, when he had, just before, produced that known Testimony of *S. Augustine*? You see then, the *Bishop* had some reason to say, *Some of your Church* asserted this to be *S. Augustine's* meaning; and therefore your Instances of *some*, where but one is meant, are both impertinent and scurrilous. For, where it is evidently known, there was but one, it were a *Solæcism* to say *some*; as to say, that *some of the Apostles betrayed Christ*, when it is known, that *none but Judas* did it. But, if I should say, that *some Jesuits* had writ for the killing of *Kings*, and in the *Margent* should cite *Mariana*, no person conversant in their writings, would think it a *Solæcism*; for tho' I produce him for a remarkable Instance, yet that doth not imply, that I have none else to produce, but only that the mentioning of *one*, might shew I was not without proof of what I said. For your impudent oblique slander on the memory of that excellent Prelate *Arch-Bishop Cranmer*, when you say, *If a Catholick to disgrace the Protestant Primacy of Canterbury, should say, Some of them carried a holy Sister lock'd up in a Chest about with them, and name Cranmer only in the Margent*; His memory is infinitely above your flyest detractions; and withal, when you are about such a piece of *Criticism*, I pray, tell me, what doth *some of them* relate to? Is *Primacy* the name of *some Men*? Just as if one should disgrace the *See of Rome*, and say, *Some of them have been Atheists, Magicians, debauched, &c.* Tho' I confess, it were a great injury in this case, to cite but *one* in the *Margent*, unless in pity to the Reader; yet, you may sooner vindicate *some of them* from a *Solæcism* in Language, when the *See of Rome* went before, than *any of them* from those *Solæcisms* in manners, which your own Authors have complained of.

P. 79. But, say you, *What if this singular-plural say no such thing, as the words alledged by the Bishop signifie*? I have already granted it to have been a very venial mistake of memory in his Lordship of *Occham* for *Durandus*, in whom those very words are which are in the *Margent* of his Lordships Book, as appears in the Testimony already produced. I acknowledge therefore, that *Occham* in that place of his *Dialogues*, doth speak of the *Catholick Church of all Ages*, comprehending the *Apostles and Evangelists* in it; and in this sense he saith, that place of *S. Augustine* is to be understood. But, what advantage this is to your cause, I cannot imagine. For, what if the *Catholick Church* be taken in that comprehensive sense, to include not only the *Apostles*, but the *Church* successively from their times? Doth it hence follow, *That it is not day tho' the Sun shines*? Or rather, Doth it not follow, *That you are not so quick-sighted as you would seem to be*? And, Whether his Lordship or you come nearer the meaning of *Occham's* words, let any one judge. For they who speak of the *Church* in that comprehensive sense, do only suppose the *Infallibility* to have been in the *Primitive Apostolical Church*, but the *successive Church* to be only the chanel of conveyance of that Testimony down to us, and so they say no more than we do.

Thus

Thus Driedo expounds that place of S. Augustine ; who understands it of the Catholick Church, which was from the beginning of the Christian Faith, increasing according to the course of succession of Bishops to these times, which Church comprehends in it the College of Apostles. Do you think that these Men did believe a present Infallibility in the Church ? If so, To what end are they

Augustinus cum dicit, ego Evangelio, &c. intelligit de Ecclesia Catholica qua fuit ab initio Christiana fidei, secundum seriem successionis Episcoporum crescens ad hac usque tempora, qua sanè Ecclesia completitur Collegium Apostolorum. Driedo. Tom. 1. l. 4. cap. 4.

so careful to carry it so high as the Apostles ? Whereas, on your Principle we can have no assurance concerning any thing that the Apostles did or said but only for the Infallibility of the present Church. You must therefore understand the present Church exclusively of the Apostolical Church ; and therefore if S. Augustine be understood in their sense, he is far enough from serving your purposes. But, say you, It is evident, that S. Augustine must speak of the Church in his time, because he speaks of that Church which said to him, *Noli credere Manichæo*, which was not true of the Apostolical Church ? But, Why might not the Apostolical Church be a reason to S. Augustine, not to believe *Manichæus*, because he found no footsteps of his Doctrine in the Records of that Church ? Again, suppose he means the present Church, Doth he mean the infallible Testimony of the present Church ? Might not the Testimony of the Church, supposing it fallible, be sufficient for what S. Augustine saith of it ? I doubt it not : And, you seem to have no great confidence in this Testimony your self, when you add, *That though it be a point of Faith to believe that the Church is infallible, in delivering Scripture to us, yet it is not a point of Faith, that her Infallibility is proved out of the cited place of S. Augustine.* But, when you say, *it is sufficient that it be clear and manifest out of the Text it self*, what text do you mean ? S. Augustine's, or the Scriptures ? If St. Augustine's, you would do well to shew, by what engines you force Infallibility out of his words ; if the Scriptures, What becomes of our good Motives of Credibility ?

When his Lordship objects, *That according to your Principles, the Tradition of the present Church must be as infallible as that of the Primitive*, you very learnedly distinguish, *That if he means, the one must be as truly and really infallible, quoad substantiam, as the other, you grant it : But if he mean, the one must be as highly and perfectly infallible, as the other, quoad modum, you deny it.* Very good still ! It seems there are higher and lower degrees in Infallibility. I pray tell us, what that is which is *more than infallible* ? The present Church (you say) is infallible, but not so highly and perfectly infallible, therefore there must be degrees in Infallibility ; and since the lowest degree is infallible, that which is highly infallible, must be *more than infallible*. Again, What difference is there between the substance and the mode in Infallibility ? I had thought, the substance of Infallibility had lain in the mode ; and I should rather think Infallibility it self to be a mode of Apprehension, than talk of substance and modes in it. But, it may be, you mean such kind of modes of Infallibility, as absolute and hypothetical. If you do so, explain your self by them ; and that we may better understand your meaning, shew us whether the Church be at all capable of absolute Infallibility ; if not, What difference there is in degrees between the hypothetical Infallibility of the present and Primitive Church, supposing both infallible in delivering their Testimony, and no otherwise. For you yet again add, *Of the Churches Testimony being infallible, but not simply Divine*, but it is the infallible Testimony of a desperate cause, to have but one bad shift, and to use it so often.

S. 20.
P. 81. n. 21.
P. 80.

P. 32. Because you would be apt to say, That upon his Lordship's rejecting the Infallibility of Tradition, he left no use at all of it; He therefore tells you, *Notwithstanding that, it is serviceable for very good ends, that it induces Infidels to the reading and consideration of Scripture, and that it instructs novices, and doubters in the Faith; which two ends (you say) fall short of the end of Tradition; For (say you) it founds and establishes Believers, even the greatest Doctors of the Church; for which you cite again this same place of S. Augustine.* But did not his Lordship tell you, that some of your own understood that very place, *either of Novices or Infidels?* For which, besides the Testimony of some of your own party, he adds this reason, *because the words immediately before are, If you find one qui Evangelio nondum credit, which did not yet believe the Gospel, What wouldst thou do to make him believe? Ego vero non; &c.* To which you very prudently say nothing.

Concerning *Jacobus Almayn's* Opinion, *That we are first, and more, bound to believe the Church than the Scripture;* you would seem in terms to disavow it, tho' very faintly; *it is not altogether true;* and hope to salve it by a distinction of priority of time and nature: and you acknowledge, *That in priority of nature we are first bound to believe the Church;* and, I suppose, in priority of time too, if we believe the Scripture for the Churches sake: Yet, you would not have it said, *That we are more bound to believe the Church than Scripture;* but it is not what you would have properly said, but what follows from that antecedent, which *Jacobus Almayn* puts. *It is certain, saith he, that we are bound to believe all things contained in the Sacred Canon, upon that account alone, because the Church believes them; therefore we are first, and more, bound to believe the Church than the Scripture,* which is so evident a consequence, that nothing but shame would make you deny it.

Touching *Almayn's* and *Gerson's* reading compelleret for commoveret, his Lordship saith, *That Almayn falsifies the Text notoriously;* you say, *No;* but *you had rather charitably think, they both read it so in some Copies;* his Lordship produceth a very ancient MS. for the common reading, you none at all for that, but only the concurrent Testimonies of some Schoolmen, who must be confessed to be excellent Criticks, and well versed in ancient MSS. unless where they met with a little Greek, or some hard Latin words; and among whom, the mistake of one would pass current for want of examining Copies, let the Reader therefore judge, whether Judgment be more probable: But, I think it not worth while to say more about it.

In your vindication of the Authority of *Canus*, you make use of a very silly piece of Sophistry; for, say you, *Though he make Infidels and Novices in the Faith, to be convinced by the Authority of the Church; yet, you say, It doth not follow, that he makes the said Authority a fallible, but a certain and sure way to make them believe it.* But, 1. The Question is, Whether *Canus* doth understand that place of *S. Augustine*, of Infidels and Novices or no? 2. Suppose he says, *It is a sure way,* Doth it therefore follow, that it is an infallible way? Is nothing certain but what is infallible? I hope you are certain that the Church of Rome is the Catholick Church; but, Are you infallible that she is so? If you advance all certainty to Infallibility, or bring down all Infallibility to Certainty, every Christian is as infallible as your Church is: For, I make no question, but that every good Christian is certain of the Grounds and Principles of his Religion. The same thing you return upon again (after to little purpose you multiply words about *Canus* and *Stapleton's* Testimonies.) For, say you, because *S. Augustine* speaks of a sure way, therefore he must mean an infallible way, as though what was not supernaturally infallible, was presently unsure. I pray, tell me, Are you sure that two and two make

make four? Yet, I hope you will not say, You are *supernaturally Infallible* that they do so. I hope, you are sure, there is a *Pope at Rome*, and a goodly *College of Cardinals* there; but, Are you infallible in this? It is not then certainly the same, to deny a thing to be *infallible*, and to make it *un-
sure*: And, you are either very *weak*, or very *wilful*, in saying so. In what sense this so much controverted place of *St. Augustine* is to be understood, will be afterwards discussed; and whether it be intended wholly for *Infidels* or no: Only I shall take notice now, how, in the *last words* of this Chapter, you would again infer *Infallibility* from *undoubted Certainty*. For, say you, *the Church in St. Augustine's time, esteemed her self undoubtedly certain, that the Gospel was the Infallible Word of God*; for otherwise she might be deceived her self, and deceive others in commanding them to believe that to be *God's Word*, which was only the word of *Man*: But, What is it you would infer from all this? For we believe the *Church* as undoubtedly certain, as may be, that the *Scriptures* are *God's Word*; yet we are far enough from believing that her Testimony now is *supernaturally Infallible*.

F. D.

C H A P. VII.

196:1.H.

The Protestant Way of resolving Faith:

Several Principles premised in order to it. The distinct Questions set down, and their several Resolutions given. The Truth of Matters of Fact, the Divinity of the Doctrine, and of the Books of Scripture, distinctly resolved into their proper Grounds. Moral Certainty a sufficient Foundation for Faith, and yet Christian Religion proved to be Infallibly True. How Apostolical Tradition made by his Lordship a Foundation of Faith. Of the certainty we have of the Copies of Scripture, and the Authority of them. St. Augustine's Testimony concerning Church-Authority, largely discussed and vindicated. Of the private Spirit, and the necessity of Grace. His Lordship's way of resolving Faith vindicated. How far Scripture may be said to be known by its own Light. The several Testimonies of Bellarmine, Brierly, and Hooker, cleared.

HAVING thus far followed you through all your intricacies and windings, and shewed, with what diligence and subtilty you would juggle Men out of their *Faith*, under a pretence of *Infallibility*; it will be necessary for the vindicating our *Doctrine*, and the clearing this important Controversie with all evidence and perspicuity, to lay down those certain grounds which we build our *Faith* upon. And, although it be one of the greatest of your Modern Artifices to perswade the World, that *Protestants* have no certain grounds of *Faith* at all, yet I doubt not but to make it evident, that the way taken by the most judicious and considerative *Protestants*, is as satisfactory and reasonable, as I have already made it appear, that yours is unreasonable and ridiculous. Which I shall the rather do, because through the want of a clear and distinct apprehension of the true way of resolving *Faith*, no Controversie in Religion hath been more obscure and involved, than this hath been. Therefore for our more distinct method of proceeding, I shall first endeavour to prevent Misunderstanding, by premising several things which are necessary for a through opening the state of the Controversie, and then come to the resolution of it. The things then I would premise, are these following:

C c 2

I. That

1. That we enquire not after the *reason*, why we assent to what is divinely revealed, but after the *reason why we believe any thing to be a Divine Revelation*. Therefore when Men speak of the *last resolution of Faith* into the *Veracity of God* revealing, they speak that which is undoubtedly true, but it reacheth not our present enquiry. I freely grant, that the *ultimate reason* why any thing is believed, is upon the *Testimony* of him from whom it comes; and the greater the knowledge and fidelity is, of him whose Testimony I believe, the *stronger my Assent* is, supposing I have sufficient evidence that it is his Testimony. But that is not our present Question; for it being taken for granted among all *Christians*, that *God's Testimony* is *absolutely Infallible*, there can no dispute arise concerning the ground of resolving *Faith*, supposing *God's Revelation* to be sufficiently known. For no one questions but *God's Veracity*, however discovered, is a sufficient ground for *Faith*; but all the question is, How we come to know wherein this *Veracity of God* doth discover it self; or what those things are which are immediately revealed by him. Therefore to tell us, that the *resolution of Faith* is into *God's Infallible Testimony*, without shewing on what account this Testimony is to be believed to be from *God*, is, to tell us that which no one doubts of, and to escape that which is the main question. For in case *Isaac* should have denied submission to his *Father's* Will when he went to be sacrificed, till he could be satisfied concerning the lawfulness of that action which his *Father* went about; Do you think it had been satisfactory to him, if *Abraham* had told him, that *God* had power to relax his own *Laws*, and therefore he need not question the lawfulness of the action; might not *Isaac* have presently answered, That he did not question, but what *God* commanded was lawful; but that he desired, was, some evidence that he had a *Revelation* for what he did. And the answer to this had been only pertinent and satisfactory. So that he might have no reason to question it, although he did not believe any thing more than common Fidelity in his *Father's* Testimony. For *God* never, (when Revelations were most common) thought it necessary to multiply *Revelations* so far, as to make one necessary to attest another; but that *Revelation* which was communicated to one was obligatory to all concerned in it, though they could have nothing but *Moral Certainty* for it. By this it appears, that when we now speak of the *Resolution of Faith*, though the *utmost reason* of our assent is, that *Infallibility* which is supposed in *Divine Testimony*, yet the nearest and most proper resolution of it, is, into the grounds inducing us to believe that such a Testimony is *truly Divine*, and the *resolution* of this cannot be into any *Divine Testimony* without a *Process in infinitum*.

2. That when we speak of the *resolution of Faith*, by *Faith* we understand a *rational and discursive Act* of the Mind. For *Faith* being an assent upon *Evidence*, or *Reason* inducing the Mind to assent, it must be a *rational and discursive Act*; and such a one that one may be able to give an account of to another. And this account which Men are able to give why they do believe, or on what ground they do it, is that which we call *resolving Faith*. And by this it appears, that whatever resolves *Faith* into its *efficient cause*, (which some improperly call *the Testimony of the Spirit*) though it may be true, yet comes not home to the question. For if by the *Testimony of the Spirit* be meant that *Operation* of the *Spirit* whereby saving *Faith* is wrought in us, then it gives no account from the *thing* to be believed, why we assent to it, but only shewshow *Faith* is wrought in us by way of *Efficiency*; which is rather resolving the Question about the necessity of *Grace* than the grounds

grounds of Faith. Our question is not then, concerning the necessity of *infused habits of Grace*, but of those *rational Inducements* which do incline the Mind to a firm assent. For *Faith* in us, however it is wrought, being a *Persuasion* of the Mind, it is not conceivable how there should be any *discursive Act* of the Mind, without some *reason* causing the Mind to assent to what is propounded to it? For without this, *Faith* would be an unaccountable thing, and the *Spirit of Revelation* would not be the *Spirit of Wisdom*; and *Religion* would be exposed to the contempt of all unbelievers, if we were able to give no other account of *Faith*, than that it is wrought in us by the *Spirit of God*. When we speak therefore of the *resolving Faith*, we mean, what are the *rational Inducements to believe*, or what evidence there is in the Object propounded to make us firmly assent to it.

3. According to the different Acts of Faith, there must be assigned a different resolution of Faith. For every Act being rational and discursive, must have its proper grounds belonging to it; unless we suppose that Act elicited without any reason for it, which is incongruous with the nature of the humane Understanding.

There are then in the question of resolution of Faith, these three questions §. 2. to be resolved. First, *Why I believe those things to be true which are contained in the Book called the Scripture?* 2. *Why I believe the Doctrine contained in that Book to be Divine?* 3. *Why I believe the Books themselves to be of Divine Revelation?* Now every one of these questions admits of a different way of Resolution; as will appear by the handling each of them distinctly.

1. If I be asked, *On what grounds I believe the things to be true which are contained in Scripture*, my answer must be, *From the greatest evidence of truth*, which things of that nature are capable of. If therefore the Persons who are supposed to have writ these things, were such who were fully acquainted with what they writ of; if they were such Persons who cannot be suspected of any design to deceive Men by their Writings; and if I be certain that these which go under the name of their Writings, are undoubtedly theirs; I must have sufficient grounds to believe the truth of them. Now that the writers of these things cannot be suspected of Ignorance, appears by the time and age they writ in, when the story of these things was new, and such multitudes were willing enough to have contradicted it, if any thing had been amiss: Besides, some of the writers had been intimately conversant with the Person and actions of him whom they writ most of. That they could have no intent to deceive, appears from the Simplicity and Candour both of their Actions and Writings, from their contempt of the World, and exposing themselves to the greatest hazards to bear witness to them. That these are the very same writings, appears by all the evidence can be desired; For we have as great, if not much greater reason to believe them to be the Authors of the Books under their Names, than any other writers of any Books whatsoever, both because the matters are of greater moment, and therefore Men might be supposed more inquisitive about them; and that they have been unanimously received for theirs from the very time of their being first written, (except some very few, which upon strict examination were admitted too) and we find these very Books cited by the learned Christians under these Names in that time, when it had been no difficulty to have found out several of the Original Copies themselves. When therefore they were universally received by Christians, never doubted of by the Jews, or Heathen Philosophers: We have as great evidence for this first Act of Faith, as it is capable of. And he is unreasonable who desires more.

2. If

2. If I be asked, why I believe the Doctrine contained in these Books to be Divine? I must give in two things for answer. 1. That in the Age when the Doctrine was delivered, there was sufficient reason to believe it Divine. 2. That if there was sufficient reason then, we have sufficient reason now.

1. That in the Age when the Doctrine was delivered, there was sufficient reason to believe it Divine; Supposing then, that we already believe upon the former answer, that all the Matters of Fact be true. I answer, that if Christ did such unparallel'd Miracles, and rose from the Dead, they who heard his Doctrine had reason to believe it to be of God: And this I suppose the greatest Infidel would not deny, if himself had been one of the witnesses of his Actions and Resurrection.

2. That if they had reason then, we have so now; because Tradition to us doth only supply the want of our Senses, as to what Christ did and spake; i. e. That Tradition is a kind of derivative and perpetuated Sensation to us; it being of the same use to us now which our Eyes and Ears had been, if we had been actually present when Christ delivered his Doctrine and wrought his Miracles. Which that we may better understand, we may consider what the use of our Senses had been, if we had been then present; and consequently what the use of Tradition is now to us. Now it is apparent, that the use of the Senses, to those who saw the Miracles and heard the Doctrine of Christ, was not to give any Credibility to either of them, but only to be the means of conveying to them those things which might induce them to believe; the same doth Tradition now to us, it doth not in it self make the Doctrine more credible, but supplies the use of our Senses in a certain conveyance of those things to us which were the Motives to believe them. For the Motives to Faith both to them and us are the same, only the manner of conveyance is different; but our case is much the same with those who lived in the same Age, but by reason of distance of place could not be personally present at what Christ did or said; now if those Persons were obliged to believe, and had sufficient reason for Faith, who by reason of distance of place could not exercise their Senses about Christ's Doctrine and Miracles, the same reason and obligation have we, who cannot do it by reason of distance of time. And if there be any advantage on either side, it is on ours, because though the Tradition doth not in it self give any Credibility to the Doctrine, yet there are such circumstances accompanying this Tradition, which may much facilitate our belief above theirs: Because by such a continued Tradition we have an evidence of the efficacy of this Doctrine, which had so continual a power as to engage so many in all Ages since its first appearance to be the propagators and defenders of it. And therefore this hath very much the advantage of the report of any credible Persons in that Age, who might report to any at distance the Miracles and Doctrine of Christ. And this is the way of resolution of Faith, which the Scripture it self directs us to. How shall we escape if we neglect so great Salvation, which at the first began to be spoken by the Lord, and was confirmed unto us by them that heard him: God also bearing them witness both with signs and wonders, and with diverse miracles and gifts of the Holy Ghost, according to his own will? Where we plainly see, the resolution of Faith as to the Divinity of the Doctrine was into the Miracles wrought for the confirmation of it, (which was the proper witness or testimony of the Holy Ghost) but the means of conveyance was by the Tradition of those who were eye and ear-witnesses of what Christ said or did. As therefore it was not supposed necessary for them who saw the Miracles of Christ, either to have some inward Testimony of the Spirit, or some external Infallible Testimony of the Church,

to assure them that these *miracles* were really done by *Christ*, but *God* left them to the judgment of *sense*; so proportionably neither of those two is now necessary for the resolution of our *Faith*, but *God* instead of the judgment of *sense* leaves us to the evidence of *Tradition*.

Object. But all this is (you say) no more than *Moral certainty*, which being fallible, we cannot from thence be assured that *Christian Religion* is infallibly true? *Ans.* This being the great bug-bear wherewith you would fright Men out of their *Religion*, I shall in this place shew, that it serves only to scare fools and children with. For, 1. What greater certainty had they who lived in the time of *Christ* and his *Apostles*, and did not see their *Miracles*? Had they, or could they have, any more than this you call *moral Certainty*? and, Do you really think, that all such could not be sufficiently assured, that *Christian Religion* was infallibly true? 2. *Moral Certainty* may be a sufficient Foundation for the most firm Assent; and therefore, if the matter to be believed be the infallible Truth of a *Doctrine* upon suitable evidence, though we have now but *moral Certainty* of that evidence, the Assent may be firm to such a *Doctrine* as infallible. And therefore the grand mistake lies here, as tho' our *Faith* were resolved finally into this *moral Certainty*; or, as if the *Faith* of those who saw *Christ's Miracles*, were resolved into their eyes, and not into the *Miracles*; for as their eyes were but the means of conveyance of that evidence which was infallible, so is that *Tradition* to us by which we have our *Certainty* of those evidences of the infallible Truth of *Christian Religion*. And we are further to consider that the nature of *Certainty* is not so much to be taken from the matters themselves, as from the grounds inducing the Assent; that is, Whether the things be *Mathematical*, *Physical*, or *Moral*; if there be no reason to question the grounds of belief, the case is all one as to the nature of the Assent. So that *moral Certainty* may be as great as *Mathematical* and *Physical*, supposing as little reason to doubt in moral things as to their natures, as in *Mathematical* and *Physical* as to theirs. Therefore this great quarrel about *moral Certainty* is very unreasonable; unless it be proved, that there is no cause of firm Assent upon moral grounds; now, if the cause of the Assent may be, as equal and proportionable to their nature in moral things, as in *Mathematical*; there may be as firm an Assent in the One, as in the Other, as I have already shewed. For which, this reason is plain and evident, that *Certainty* implies the taking away all suspicion of doubt: But there can be no taking away all suspicion of doubt in *Mathematical* things, without *Mathematical evidence*; but in moral things, all suspicion of doubt is removed upon moral evidence, and therefore the *Certainty* may be as great in the Assent to one as the other. Thus, we see, how unjustly, and how much to the dishonour of Religion you quarrel with moral evidence, as an uncertain thing. But, I answer yet further, 3. That the greatest assurance we can desire, that any Religion is infallibly True, is from moral Certainty; and that upon these three grounds. 1. Because the grounds of all Religion are capable of no more. 2. Because the highest evidence of any Religion must depend upon it. 3. Because this, in it self, may evidently demonstrate, that *Christian Religion* is infallibly True.

1. There can be no greater than this moral Certainty of the main Foundations of all Religion, which are, The Being of God, and Immortality of souls; without the supposition of which, there can be no such thing as Infallibility in the world; and therefore from thence I may easily prove, that there can be no more than moral Certainty of the existence of a Deity. For, if the very notion of Infallibility doth suppose a God, then you cannot infallibly

fallibly prove that there is *One*, (in your sense of Infallibility) for then you must beg the Question, and suppose that already to be, which you are proving the *existence* of : Now that, *Infallibility* in us doth suppose the *existence of God*, appears most evidently, because, Man's understanding being of it self fallible, it cannot be supposed in any thing infallible, without the *supernatural Assistance* of a being *Infallible*, which can be nothing else but God. But, if you think you have *infallible proofs*, produce them, and convince the world of *Atheists* by them : We acknowledge we have as great *evidence* and *certainty*, as humane nature is capable of, a *Being* of such a *Nature* as God is, from the consideration of his works ; but all this still is *moral Certainty* ; for the grounds are neither *Mathematically demonstrative*, nor *supernaturally infallible*. What folly and madness then is it for your party to cry out so much against *moral Certainty in Religion*, when the *Foundation* of all *Religion* is capable of no more ; And may not this justly increase our suspicion, that under *moral Certainty* you strike at the *Foundation* of all *Religion* ?

2. Suppose God give the *most infallible evidence* of any *Religion*, it is not possible, but that some who are bound to believe that *Religion*, can have any more than *moral Certainty* of it. And, for all that I know the greatest *Physical Certainty* is as liable to question as *moral* ; there being as great a possibility of *Deception* in that, as a *suspicion of doubt* in this, and oft-times greater. What advantage then had those who stood by, and saw the *miracles* of *Moses* and *Christ*, above those who did not, but had the report of them conveyed to them in an unquestionable manner ? Besides, it is apparent, *God's* great aim in any *Religion*, is most at the good of those who can have only a *moral Certainty* of the great evidences of the *Truth* of that *Religion* ; because it being *God's* intention, that the *Religion* delivered by Him, should be not meerly for the benefit of those very few persons who could be present at such things, but for the advantage of those incomparably greater numbers, who, by reason of *distance of place and age*, could not be present ; it would argue a strange want of *provision* for Men's *Faith*, unless *moral Certainty* were sufficient. Only you indeed will suppose that which *God* himself never thought necessary, *viz. an infallible Testimony* of the present *Church* ; but to what good purposes you have introduced this, hath largely appeared already.

3. *Moral Certainty yields us sufficient Assurance*, that *Christian Religion* is *infallibly true* : And that I prove, because *moral Certainty* may evidently shew us the *Credibility* of the *Christian Religion*, which you deny not, nor any else ; and, that from the *Credibility* of it, the *infallible Truth* of it may be proved, will appear by these two things :

1. That where there is evident *Credibility* in the matter propounded, there doth arise upon Men an obligation to believe : And that is proved both by your own confession (as to the *Churches Infallibility* being believed on the *Motives of Credibility*) and from *God's Intention*, in giving such *Motives*, which was, to persuade them to believe, as appears by multitudes of *places of Scripture* ; and withal, tho' the meer *Credibility* of the *Motives* might at first suppose some doubts concerning the *Infallibility* of the *Doctrine*, yet it is not consistent with any doubt, as to the *Infallibility* of the obligation to believe ; because there can be no other reason assigned of these *Motives of Credibility*, than the inducing on Men an obligation to *Faith*.

2. That where there is such an obligation to believe, we have the greatest assurance, that the matter to be believed is *infallibly True* : Which depends upon this manifest proof, That *God* cannot oblige Men to believe a lye ; it being repugnant

nant to all our conceptions of the *Veracity* and *Goodness* of God, to imagine, that God should require from Men (on the pain of *eternal damnation*, for not believing) to believe something as *infallibly True*, which is really false. Thus, you see, what a clear and pregnant demonstration we have of the *infallible Truth* of *Christian Religion* from *moral Certainty*; How injurious then have those of your party been, who have charged this opinion of believing upon *moral Certainty*, with betraying *Religion*, and denying *Christian Religion* to be *infallibly True*? Thus much for this grand Objection; I now come to the last Question considerable in the Resolution.

3. *On what account do I believe these particular Books of Scripture to be God's Word?* Which may admit of a double sense: 1. *On what account I do believe the Doctrine contained in these Books to be God's Word?* 2. *On what account I do believe the Books containing this Doctrine to be God's Word?* As to the first, I have answered already, *viz.* Upon the same rational evidence which God gave, that the *Testimony* of those who delivered, was a *Divine and infallible Testimony*: To the second, I answer in these two Propositions:

1. That the last Resolution of Faith is not into the *Infallibility of the Instrument of conveyance*, but into the *Infallibility of that Doctrine*, which is thereby conveyed to us. For the writing of this *Doctrine* is only the condition by which this *Revelation* is made manifest to us; it being evident from the nature of the thing, that the writing of a *Divine Revelation* is not necessary for the ground and reason of Faith, as to that Revelation: because Men may believe a *Divine Revelation* without it; as is not only evident in the case of the *Patriarchs*, but of all those, who in the time of *Christ*, and the *Apostles*, did believe the truth of the *Doctrine of Christ* before it was written. If therefore the writing be only the condition of the manifestation of the Object in a certain way to us, the ground and reason of Faith, is not to be resolved into that which is only the mode of our knowledge of the Object to be believ'd; but into that which is properly the ground and reason why we believe that *Doctrine or Revelation* to be *Divine*, which is contained in those Books. And this is still the case of all illiterate persons, who cannot resolve their Faith properly into the *Scripture*, but into the *Doctrine* delivered them out of *Scripture*. Hence we may discern the difference between the *Formal Object*, and the *Rule of Faith*; the *Formal Object* is that evidence which is given of the *Infallibility of the Testimony* of those who delivered the *Doctrine*; the *infallible Rule of Faith*; to us, is the *Scripture*, *viz.* that which limits and bounds the *material objects* of Faith, which we are bound to believe; and this doth therefore discover to us what those things are, which on the account of the *Formal Object*, we are obliged to believe.

2. Those who believe the *Doctrine of Scripture* to be *Divine*, have no reason to question the *infallible conveyance of that Doctrine to us*, in those Books we call the *Scripture*. Therefore, whatever things we are to believe in order to salvation, we have as great evidence as we can desire, that they are *infallibly conveyed to us*.

1. If the *Doctrine of Christ* be True and Divine, then all the Promises he made were accomplished: Now, that was one of the greatest, That his Spirit should lead his Apostles into all Truth; Can we then reasonably think, that if the Apostles had such an *infallible Assistance of the Spirit of God* with them, in what they spake in a transitory way to them who heard them, that they should want it in the delivering those Records to the Church, which were to be the standing monument of this Doctrine to all Ages and Generations. If *Christ's Doctrine* therefore be True, the Apostles had an *infallible Assistance of God's Spirit*; if they had so in delivering the *Doctrine of Christ* by preaching,

ing, nothing can be more unreasonable, than to imagine such should want it, who were employed to give an account to the world of the nature of this *Doctrine*, and of the *Miracles* which accompanied *Christ* and his *Apostles*. So that, it will appear an absurd thing to assert, that the *Doctrine of Christ* is *Divine*, and to question, whether we have the *infallible Records* of it. It is not pertinent to our Question, in what way the *Spirit of God* assisted them that wrote, Whether by immediate *suggestion* of all such things which might be sufficiently known without it; and whether in some things which were not of concernment, it might not leave them to their own judgement; (as in that place, *When they had rowed about five and twenty or thirty furlongs*, when, no doubt, *God's Spirit* knew infallibly whether it was, but thought not fit to reveal it) whether in some lighter circumstances the Writers were subject to any inadvertencies (the negative of which is more piously credible) whether meer *historical passages* needed the same infallible Assistance, that *Prophetical* and *Doctrinal*; these things, I say, are not necessary to be resolved, it being sufficient in order to *Faith*, that the *Doctrine* we are to believe, as it was infallibly delivered to the world, by the preaching of *Christ* and his *Apostles*, so it is infallibly conveyed to us in the *Books of Scripture*.

2. Because these *Books* were owned for *Divine* by those *Persons* and *Ages*, who were most competent Judges, whether they were so or no. For the Age of the *Apostles* was sufficiently able to judge, whether those things which are said to be spoken by *Christ*, or written by the *Apostles*, were really so or no. And we can have no reason at all to question, but what was delivered by them, was infallibly true. Now, from that first Age we derive our knowledge concerning the *Authority* of these *Books*, which being conveyed to us in the most unquestionable and universal *Tradition*, we can have no reason in the world to doubt, and therefore the greatest reason firmly to assent, that the *Books* we call the *Scripture*, are the *infallible Records* of the *Word of God*. And thus much may suffice in general concerning the Protestant Way of resolving Faith: I now return to the examination of what you give us by way of answer to his Lordships discourse.

The first Assault you make upon his Lordship, is, for making *Apostolical Tradition* a ground of Faith: but because your peculiar excellency lies in the involving plain things; the best service I can do, is to lay things open as they are; by which means we shall easily discern where the truth lies. I shall therefore first shew, how far his Lordship makes *Apostolical Tradition* a ground of Faith, and then consider what you have to object against it. In that Section which your Margent refers to, all that he says of it, is, That the Voice and Tradition of that Church which included in it *Apostles*, *Disciples*, and such as had immediate Revelation from Heaven, was *Divine*, and the Word of God from them is of like validity written or delivered, And, as to this Tradition (saith he) there is abundance of Certainty in it self, but how far it is evident to us, shall after appear. At the end of the next n. 21. he saith, That there is double Authority, and both *Divine*, that confirms *Scripture* to be the Word of God. Tradition of the *Apostles* delivering it, and the internal worth and argument in the *Scripture*, obvious to a soul prepared by the present Churches Tradition, and God's Grace. But, n. 23. he saith, That this *Apostolical Tradition* is not the sole and only means to prove *Scripture* *Divine*, but the moral perswasion, reason, and force of the present Church, is ground enough for any one to read the *Scripture*, and esteem reverently of it. And this once done, the *Scripture* hath then In and home-arguments enough to put a soul that hath but ordinary Grace, out of doubt, that the *Scripture* is the Word of God, infallible and

and Divine. I suppose his Lordship's meaning may be comprized in these particulars. 1. That to those who lived in the *Apostolical Times*, the *Tradition of Scripture*, by those who had an infallible Testimony, was a sufficient ground of their believing it infallibly true. 2. That though the conveyance of that *Tradition* to us be not infallible, yet it may be sufficient to raise in us a high esteem and veneration for the *Scripture*. 3. That those who have this esteem for the *Scripture*, by a through studying and consideration of it, may undoubtedly believe that *Scripture* is the *Divine and Infallible Word of God*. This I take to be the substance of his Lordship's Discourse. We now come to examine what you object against him. Your first demand is, *How comes Apostolical Primitive Tradition to work upon us, if the present Church be fallible?* Which I shall answer by another, *How come the Decrees of Councils to work upon you, if the reporters of those Decrees be fallible?* If you say, *It is sufficient that the Decree it self be infallible, but it is not necessary that the reporter of those Decrees should be so;* The same I say concerning the *Apostolical Tradition of Scripture*, though it were *Infallible* in their *Testimony*, yet it is not necessary that the conveyance of it to us should be *Infallible*. And if you think your self bound to believe the Decrees of *General Councils* as *Infallible*, though fallibly conveyed to you; Why may not we say the same concerning *Apostolical Tradition*? Whereby you may see, though *Tradition* be *fallible*, yet the matter conveyed by it, may have its proper effect upon us. Your next Enquiry (if I understand it) is to this sense, *Whether Apostolical Tradition be not then as credible as the Scriptures?* I answer freely (supposing it equally evident) what was delivered by the *Apostles* to the Church by word or writing, hath equal *Credibility*: You attempt to prove, *That there is equal evidence, because the Scripture is only known by the Tradition of the Church, to be the same that was recommended by the Apostolical Church, which you have likewise for Apostolical Tradition.* But, 1. Do you mean the same *Apostolical Tradition* here or no, which the *Archbishop* speaks of, i. e. that *Act of the Apostles*, whereby they delivered the *Doctrine of Christ* upon their *Testimony* to the World? If you mean this *Tradition*, for my part, I do not understand it as any thing really distinct from the *Tradition of the Scripture* it self. For, although I grant, that the *Apostles* did deliver that *Doctrine* by *Word* as well as *Writing*, yet if that *Tradition by Word* had been judged sufficient, I much question whether we had ever had any written *Records* at all. But, because of the speedy decay of an *Oral Tradition*, if there had been no standing *Records*, it pleased God in his infinite *Wisdom* and *Goodness*, to stir up some fit Persons to digest those things summarily into writing, which otherwise would have been exposed to several *Corruptions* in a short time. For we see presently in the Church, notwithstanding this, how suddenly the *Gnosticks, Valentinians, Manichees* and others, did pretend some *secret Tradition of Christ* or his *Apostles* distinct from their writings. When therefore you can produce as certain evidence for any *Apostolical Tradition* distinct from *Scripture*, as we can do, that the *Books of Scripture* were delivered by the *Apostles* to the Church, you may then be hearkened to, but not before. 2. We have other ways to judge of the *Identity* of the *Copies of Scripture* (which we have) with those delivered by the *Primitive Church*, besides the *Testimony* of the *present Church*. And the judgment of the *present Church* considered merely as such, can be no argument to secure any Man concerning the *Integrity* and *Incorruption* of the *Books of Scripture*. We do therefore justly appeal to the ancient *Copies*, and *MSS.* which confirm the *Incorruption* of ours. But, say you, *What infallible Certainty have we of them, beside Church Tradition?*

P. 82.

P. 83.

Very wisely said in several respects, as though no *Certainty* less than *Infallible*, could serve Men's turns as to ancient *Copies* of *Scripture*, and as though your *Church* could give Men *Infallible Certainty* which *Copies* were ancient, and which were not. But for our parts, we should not be at all nearer any *Certainty*, much less *Infallibility* concerning the *Authenticity* of any ancient *Copies*, because your *Church* declared it self for them; neither can we imagine it at all necessary in the examination of ancient *Copies* to have any *Infallible Certainty* at all of them. For as well you may pretend it as to any other Authors, when all that we look after in such *Copies* is only that evidence which things of that nature are capable of. But you make his *Lordship* give as wise an answer to this question of yours; *They may be examined and approved by the authentic Autographs of the very Apostles*. Where is it that this answer is given by his *Lordship*? If you may be allowed to make questions and answers too, no doubt, the one will be as wise as the other. But I suppose you thought, nothing could be said pertinent in this case, but what you make his *Lordship* say: And then by the unreasonableness of that answer, because none of these *Autographs* are supposed extant, and because if they were so, all Men could not be *Infallibly certain* of them, you think you have sufficient advantage against your Adversary, because thereby it would appear there can be no certainty of *Scripture* but from the *Authority* of your *Church*. To which because it may seem to carry on your great design of rendring *Religion* uncertain, I shall return a particular answer.

§. 6.

I. Supposing we could have no *Certainty* concerning the *Copies* of *Scripture* but from *Tradition*, this doth not at all advantage your *Cause*, unless you could prove, that no other *Tradition* but that of your *Church* can give us any certainty of it. Give me leave then to make this Supposition, That *God* might not have given this *supernatural Assistance* to your *Church*, which you pretend makes it *Infallible*. Whether Men through the *universal consent* of Persons of the *Christian Church* in all *Ages*, might not have been undoubtedly certain, That the *Scripture* we have, was the same delivered by the *Apostles*? i. e. Whether a *matter of fact*, in which the whole *Christian World* was so deeply engaged, that not only their Credit, but their Interest was highly concerned in it, could not be attested by them in a credible manner? Which is as much as to ask, Whether the whole *Christian World* was not at once besotted and infatuated in the grossest manner, so as to suffer the *Records* of those things which concerned their eternal welfare, to be imbezzled, falsified, or corrupted, so as to mistake them for *Apostolical Writings*, which were nothing so. If it be not then credible, that the *Christian World* should be so monstrously imposed upon, and so grossly deceived, then certainly the *Universal Tradition* of this *Society* may yield unquestionable evidence to any inquisitive Person, as to the *Integrity* and *Incorruption* of the *Body* of *Scriptures*. And if it may yield such evidence, why doth it not so? When we see this was the very case of the *Christian World* in all *Ages*. Some *Writings* were delivered to the *Church* of the Age they lived in, by the *Apostles*; these *Writings* were so delivered, as that the *Christians* understood they were of things of more concernment to them than the whole *World* was; these *Writings* were then received, embraced, and publicly read; these *Writings* were preserved by them so sacred and inviolable, that it was accounted a crime of the highest nature to deliver the *Copies* of them into the hands of the *Heathen Persecutors*; these *Writings* were still owned by them as *Divine*, and the *Rule* and *Standard* of *Faith*, these were appealed to in all *Disputes* among them, these were preserved from the attempts of *Heretics*,

ticks, vindicated from the Assaults of the most learned Infidels, transcribed into the Books of the most diligent Christians, transmitted from one Generation to another, as the most sacred depositum of Heaven; And yet is it possible, to suppose that these writings should be extorted out of their hands by violence, abused under their eyes by fraud, or suffered to be lost by negligence. Yet no other way can be imagined, why any should suspect the Books of Scripture which we have are not the same with those delivered by the Apostles. All which are such unreasonable Suppositions, that they could hardly enter into any head but yours, or such whose cause you manage in these disputes; the most profligate Atheists, or most unreasonable Scepticks. If then we entertain but mean and ordinary thoughts of the Christians of all Ages, if we look upon them as silly Men abused into a Religion by Fraud and Imposture; yet we cannot doubt, but that these Persons were careful to preserve the Records of that Religion, because they were so diligent in the study of it, so venturous for it, such enemies to the corrupters of it, so industrious in propagating the knowledge of it to their Friends and Posterity. Do you think our Nation did ever want an Infallible Testimony to preserve the Magna Charta, supposing no authentick Record of it kept in the Publick Archives of the Nation? Would not Men's Interest make them careful to preserve it inviolable, especially considering the frequency of Causes, whose decision depends upon it, and the dispersion of the Copies abroad, and the diligence of such whose profession leads them to look to such things. And will not the same reasons hold in a greater measure for the Integrity and Incorruption of Scriptures? Do not the eternal Concerns of all Christians depend upon those Sacred Records, that, if those be not true, they were of all Men most miserable? Were not innumerable Copies of these Writings suddenly dispersed abroad, and all Christians accounted it a part of their Religion to search and enquire into them? Hath there not always been a succession of diligent and faithful Persons, whose office and Profession it hath been to read, interpret, and vindicate these Books? And who have left excellent Monuments of their Endeavours in this nature? Is it then possible to suppose all those Copies at once imbeuled, all those Christians in one age deceived, all those Divines so secure and negligent that there should be any considerable alteration, much less any total depravation of these Writings? When once I see a whole Corporation consent to burn their publick Charter, and substitute a new one in the place of it, and this not be suspected or discovered; When I shall see a Magna Charta foisted, and neither King nor People be sensible of such a Cheat; When all the World shall conspire to deceive themselves and their Children, I may then suspect such an Imposture as to the Scripture, but not before. And will not all this persuade you, that there is no necessity of making your Church Infallible in order to our Certainty, that we have the same Books of Scripture which were delivered by the Apostles? If not, the next news I shall expect to hear from you, will be, That we can have no certainty of the Being of God, or the Foundation of all Religion, but from your Churches Infallibility; there being every jot as much reason to say, that all Mankind should be deceived into the belief of a Deity by some cunning Politicians, as that all Christians should be deceived as to the belief of such Books to be Scripture which were universally corrupted; and if you understood Consequences, you would have urged one as soon as the other. But still remember, into what precipices this good Doctrine of Infallibility leads you.

But it may be your meaning is more gentle and easie, than to suppose there could be no certainty as to all the Books being the same, but only that

that we cannot have any *Infallible Certainty* that there are no *Corruptions* crept into these *Books* which we have, but from your *Churches Testimony*. To which I answer, 1. That there is no reason to suppose this should be your meaning. 2. Supposing it were your meaning, there is no reason in the thing.

1. *There is no reason to suppose this should be your meaning*, for you are speaking of such things which are necessary to be believed, and therefore are properly *Objects of Faith*, but that there are no kind of *Corruptions* crept into the *Copies of Scripture*, cannot with you be an *Object of Faith*. For those of your Party do some of them confess, and others contend, that there are many *Corruptions* crept into the *Hebrew Text* of the *Old Testament*, and the *Greek* of the *New*; and that there are abundance of *Corruptions* in your *Vulgar Latin* is not only abundantly proved by our Writers, but acknowledged by the learnedest of your own, and irrefragably demonstrated by the different Editions of *Sixtus* and *Clement*.

Suppose this were your meaning, *there were no reason in the thing*; For, 1. *Your Church cannot Infallibly assure us, there are no Corruptions*. 2. *We may be sufficiently assured of it without the Testimony of your Church*.

1. *Your Church cannot assure us at all, much less Infallibly, that there are no such Corruptions*. For what reason can there be, *Why we should rely on the judgment of only a part of the whole Society of Christians*, and that part at great opposition with many other considerable Churches; must we then believe your Church where it agrees with, or it differs from the rest? If only where it agrees with the rest, then it is not the *Testimony* of your Church we rely on, but the *universal consent* of all: If where it differs, shew us some reason, why we should believe your Church in opposition to all others. Especially, 1. When we consider what contradiction there hath been in the *Testimony* of your Church about this very thing: As appears not only by the great difference among your writers concerning the *authentick Copies*, some still defending the *Hebrew and Greek Texts*, and others standing up for that great *Diana* of Rome the *Vulgar Latin*. Considering then, that by the Decree of the Council of Trent the *Vulgar Latin* is looked on by you as the most *authentick Copy* of the *Scripture*, let any one judge whether ever this could be judged more authentick, than when the Pope himself in *Cathedra* doth revise any *Edition* of it, and use all possible care for the setting it forth, not only comparing it with the best ancient MSS. but taking the pains to correct it with his own hand, both before and after the *Press*, and all this was done by *Sixtus 5.* as himself declares in the *Preface* to his *Edition* of the *Vulgar Latin*, A. D. 1590. Yet within little more than two Years after comes out the *Edition* of *Clement 8.* which as appears by the computation of such who have taken the pains to compare them, differs from the other in some thousands of places. Now, I pray tell me, what *Infallible Certainty* are we like to have concerning the *Copies of Scripture*, being the same with those delivered by the *Apostles*, from the *Infallibility* of your Church, when this *Testimony* of your Church doth so finely contradict it self within little more than two Years time? Nay, when *Sixtus 5.* his care was so great and extraordinary in his *Edition*, that an *Inscription* was made in the *Vatican*, in *perpetuam rei memoriam*, which is in Letters of Gold in these words,

SACRAM PAGINAM EX CONCILII TRIDENTINI
PRÆSCRIPTO QUAM EMENDATISSIMAM DI-
VULGARI MANDAVIT.

Which *Inscription*, as *Angelus Roccha* tells us, was purposely made to set forth that infinite care and pains which the Pope took in that edition, *Which* were so great (saith he) that it is impossible that any should recount them, and for his own part he stood astonished when he saw them: for he not only carefully corrected the Copy before the Impression, but reviewed it sheet by sheet after, that the edition might be the more faithful. And shall we after all this believe that *Sixtus 5.* never lived to see this edition compleat, which is the miserable shift some of your party have to avoid this evident contradiction: Or shall we think, what others pretend, That he never lived to authorize this Edition of his, whereas his *Brieve* doth in terms declare this to be the authentick vulgar Latin, which the Decree of the Council of Trent had respect to; but this *Brieve*, others say, tho' provided was never proclaimed; It seems then the Pope's *Infalibillity* depends upon Proclamation; but was not this *Bull* sufficiently proclaimed which is extant in those editions of *Sixtus 5.* with an injunction that this Bible be read in all Churches *ne minimâ quidem particulâ, mutatâ, additâ, vel detractâ*, without any the least alteration. Now then when the *Vulgar Latin* is owned by the Council of Trent for the authentick Copy of Scripture; when the Pope whose testimony must be supposed *Infalible* takes great pains in prosecution of the decree of that Council to declare and set forth the true authentick edition of this *Vulgar Latin*, When should we ever, if not now, expect some *Infalible certainty* of the true Copy of the Scripture? yet so far are we from it, that not long after Men are forbidden the use of that edition under the penalty of the great Excommunication. And all this, forsooth, under the pretence of *Typographical faults*, and what then must we think of that Pope who took such incessant pains to correct them? Thus we see how far we are from any certainty at all, much more from any *Infalible certainty* concerning the true Copies of Scripture from the authority of your Church. 2. The *authenticallness* of those Copies set forth by the appointment of the Council of Trent and the approbation of the Pope, hath no greater evidence of certainty than any other Copies of Scripture, if they have so much. For all that *Sixtus 5.* pretends for the *authenticallness* of that Copy, is, the agreement of it with the ancient and approved Copies both Printed and MSS. which he had caused to be diligently searched in Libraries, Than which, (saith he) there can be no more firm or certain argument of the true and genuine text. Well said however in this! But if the Latin Copies be so sure a rule to judge of the *authenticallness* of the Text by, shall not much more the ancient Copies of the Original Hebrew and Greek; especially when we consider, that the vast difference of the *Clementine* and *Sixtine Bibles* lay in this, that *Clement the 8.* did correct the *Vulgar Latin* according to the original in above two thousand places, when the contrary reading was established by *Sixtus*. For the Pope where he pleased took the *Marginal Annotations* in the *Lovain Bibles* and inserted them into the text; which *Marginal Annotations* contain the different readings which were observed from the comparing the *Vulgar Latin* with the *Originals*, as appears by the *Preface* to the *Lovain Bibles*. And although the Pope *ex Apostolica potestate plenitudine* (as *Sixtus 5.* phraseth it in the *Bull* before his Bibles)

In hac autem germani textus peruestigatione, satis perspicue inter omnes constat, nullum argumentum esse certius ac firmitus, quam antiquorum probatorumque Codicum Latino-rum fidem, quos tam impressos, quam MSS. ex bibliothecis variis conquirendos curavi-mus. Sixtus 5. Præfat.

Bibles) did take and leave where he pleased himself, yet it is evident from those who have compared them, that above two thousand places are reformed according to the *Originals*; and more than twice as many more might have been if his Holiness had thought good. For our industrious Dr. James, who had taken the pains accurately to compare not only the *Sixtine* and *Clementine Bibles*, but the *Clementine* edition with the *Lovain Annotations*, doth in the defence of his *Bellum Papale* challenge Gretsfer the Jesuite to joyn issue with him if he dared on the point, viz. of making it appear that there were 10000 differences in the *Lovain Annotations* from the *Vulgar Latin*, and that these differences arise from the comparing it with the *Hebrew, Greek, and Chaldee*. Are we not then at a fine pass for our *Infallible certainty* concerning the *Copies of Scripture*, if the judgment of your Church must be rely'd on? Was that sufficient ground for Pope Clement to reform two thousand places, and would it not serve for all the rest? If those were truer because they agreed more with the *Originals*, were not the rest so too? And have not we the greatest reason to rely on the *Originals* when the Pope himself appeals to them, and reforms by them? According then to the judgment of your pretended *Infallible Church* we have as great certainty as they, for certainly the *Hebrew* and *Greek* are as obvious to us as them; and I never yet heard that your Popes did challenge to themselves among other *Apostolical prerogatives* the gift of tongues.

Bailins
contr. Ca-
tech. q. 15.
tr. 1. Huntl.
Controu. 1.
c. 13. sect.
9.

2. We may be sufficiently assured that there are no material corruptions in the Books of Scripture without your Churches testimony. Not that we pretend the *Apostles Autographa* are still extant for us to compare our *Copies* with (although some of your side tell us among other rarities of the *Vatican*, that the true ancient *Greek text* is their extant, which the Pope would do well to oblige the world with) but we whose eyes are not blest with such noble sights as are there lock'd up from all such who have not a good dose of implicit Faith about them, pretend to no such thing: but by the diligent comparing the present *Copies* with the most ancient MSS. by the observation of what *Citations* of Scripture are produced by those of the *Fathers* who lived when some of these *Autographa* were extant (as it is apparent some were in *Tertullian's* time, and some tell us that the authentick *Apocalypse* was preserved in the Church of *Ephesus* in *Honorius* his time) by the diligence of the primitive writers in taking notice of the least attempt for falsification or corruption of the text. For when *Marcion* began to clip and falsifie the text, *Irenaeus* presently takes notice of it and gives him a sufficient rebuke for it: and so doth *Tertullian* afterwards, and *Epiphanius* particularly takes notice of all those places which had violent hands laid upon them, and rescues them from those impure attempts, so that we still enjoy them in their integrity. So that whatever endeavours were made, they were presently discovered, as that of the *Arrians*

Iren. l. 1.
c. 28. Ter-
tul. c. Mar-
cion. l. 5.
Epiph. ha-
res. 42.

Ambros. de
Sp. S. l. 3.
c. 11. The-
odoret. de
haeret. Fab.
l. 1. Bellar.
l. 2. de V.
D. c. 7.

by S. Ambrose, that of *Tatianus* his *Monotessaron* by *Theodoret*. In so much, that *Bellarmin* himself confesseth; *Est multa depravare conati sunt haeretici, tamen nunquam defuerunt Catholici, qui eorum corruptelas dexterint, & non permiserint libros sacros corrumpi*. That the *Catholicks* were as vigilant as the *Hereticks* malicious, and therefore could never effect their design in corrupting the Scripture. Besides, it is observable, that among those multitudes of various lessons in the *New Testament*, of which R. Stephen made a collection out of sixteen MSS. of 2384. (which probably were occasioned by the general dispersion of Copies, and the multitudes of transcriptions by such as were either ignorant or careless) yet there are none which are material, so as to entrench upon the integrity and authority of the Copies as a rule of Faith and Manners; they are therefore but racings of the skin, but no

no wounds of any vital part. Abating therefore only what must necessarily be supposed in the multitudes of *Copies* transcribed, there is so great integrity and incorruption in those *Copies* we have, that we cannot but therein take notice of a peculiar hand of *Divine Providence* in preserving these authentic records of our Religion so safe to our dayes. But it is time now to return to you.

You would therefore perswade us, *That we have no ground of certainty as to the Copies of Scripture, but comparing them with the Apostles Autographa*; but I hope our former discourse hath given you a sufficient account of our certainty without seeing the *Apostles own hands*. But I pray what certainty then had the *Jews* after the Captivity, of their *Copies of the Law*? yet I cannot think you will deny them any ground of certainty in the time of *Christ* that they had the true *Copies* both of the *Law* and the *Prophets*; and I hope you will not make the *Sanhedrin*, which condemned our *Saviour* to death, to have given them their only *Infallible certainty* concerning it. If therefore the *Jews* might be certain without *Infallibility*, why may not we? for if the *Oracles of God* were committed to the *Jews* then, they are to the *Christians* now.

You yet further urge, *That there can be no certainty concerning the Autographa's of the Apostles, but by tradition: And may not every universal tradition be carried up as clearly at least to the Apostles times, as the Scriptures; by most credible Authors, who wrote in their respective succeeding ages?* I answer, We grant there can be no certainty as to the *Copies of Scripture* but from tradition, and if you can name any of those great things in Controversie between us, which you will undertake to prove to be as universal a tradition, as that of the *Scriptures*; you and I shall not differ as to the belief of it. But think not to fob us off with the tradition of the present Church instead of the Church of all ages, with the tradition of your Church instead of the Catholick, with the ambiguous testimonies of two or three of the *Fathers*, instead of the universal consent of the Church since the *Apostles times*. If I should once see you prove the *Infallibility of your Church*, the *Pope's Supremacy*, *Invocation of Saints*, *Veneration of Images*, the necessity of *Celibate in the Clergy*, a punitive *Purgatory*, the lawfulness of communicating in one kind, the expediency of the *Scriptures and Prayers being in an unknown tongue*, the sacrifice of the *Mass*, *Transubstantiation* (to name no more) by as unquestionable and universal a tradition as that whereby we receive the *Scriptures*, I shall extol you for the only person that ever did any thing considerable on your side, and I shall willingly yield my self up as a *Trophy* to your brave attempts. Either then for ever forbear to mention any such things, as *Universal Tradition among you* as to any things, besides *Scriptures*, which carry a necessity with them of being believed or practised; or once for all undertake this task, and manifest it as to the things in Controversie between us. Your next Paragraph (besides what hath been already discussed in this Chapter concerning *Apostolical tradition of Scripture*) empties it self into the old *mare mortuum* of the formal object and *Infallible application of Faith*, which I cannot think my self so much at leisure to follow you into, so often as you fall into it. When once you bring any thing that hath but the least resemblance of reason more than before, I shall afresh consider it, but not till then. What next follows concerning resolving Faith into prime *Apostolical Tradition infallibly, without the Infallibility of the present Church*, hath been already prevented by telling you, that his Lordship doth not say, *That the infallible Resolution of Faith is into that Apostolical Tradition, but into the Doctrine which is conveyed in the books of Scripture*

Bibles) did take and leave where he pleased himself, yet it is evident from those who have compared them, that above two thousand places are reformed according to the *Originals*; and more than twice as many more might have been if his Holiness had thought good. For our industrious Dr. James, who had taken the pains accurately to compare not only the *Sixtine* and *Clementine Bibles*, but the *Clementine* edition with the *Lovain Annotations*, doth in the defence of his *Bellum Papale* challenge *Gretser* the *Jesuite* to joyn issue with him if he dared on the point, viz. of making it appear that there were 10000 differences in the *Lovain Annotations* from the *Vulgar Latin*, and that these differences arise from the comparing it with the *Hebrew, Greek, and Chaldee*. Are we not then at a fine pass for our *Infallible certainty* concerning the *Copies of Scripture*, if the judgment of your *Church* must be rely'd on? Was that sufficient ground for *Pope Clement* to reform two thousand places, and would it not serve for all the rest? If those were truer because they agreed more with the *Originals*, were not the rest so too? And have not we the greatest reason to rely on the *Originals* when the *Pope* himself appeals to them, and reforms by them? According then to the judgment of your pretended *Infallible Church* we have as great certainty as they, for certainly the *Hebrew and Greek* are as obvious to us as them; and I never yet heard that your *Popes* did challenge to themselves among other *Apostolical prerogatives* the gift of tongues.

Bailius
contr. Ca-
tech. q. 15.
str. 1. Huntl.
Controv. 1.
c. 13. sect.
9.

Iren. l. 1.
c. 28. Ter-
tul. c. Mar-
cion. l. 5.
Epiph. ha-
res. 42.

Ambros. de
Sp. S. l. 3.
c. 11. The-
odoret. de
haeret. Fab.
l. 1. Bellar.
l. 2. de V.
D. c. 7.

2. We may be sufficiently assured that there are no material corruptions in the Books of Scripture without your Churches testimony. Not that we pretend the *Apostles Autographa* are still extant for us to compare our *Copies* with (although some of your side tell us among other rarities of the *Vatican*, that the true ancient *Greek text* is their extant, which the *Pope* would do well to oblige the world with) but we whose eyes are not blest with such noble sights as are there lock'd up from all such who have not a good dose of implicit Faith about them, pretend to no such thing: but by the diligent comparing the present *Copies* with the most ancient *MSS.* by the observation of what *Citations of Scripture* are produced by those of the *Fathers* who lived when some of these *Autographa* were extant (as it is apparent some were in *Tertullian's* time, and some tell us that the authentick *Apocalypse* was preserved in the Church of *Ephesus* in *Honorius* his time) by the diligence of the primitive writers in taking notice of the least attempt for falsification or corruption of the text. For when *Marcion* began to clip and falsifie the text, *Irenaeus* presently takes notice of it and gives him a sufficient rebuke for it: and so doth *Tertullian* afterwards, and *Epiphanius* particularly takes notice of all those places which had violent hands laid upon them, and rescues them from those impure attempts, so that we still enjoy them in their integrity. So that whatever endeavours were made, they were presently discovered, as that of the *Arrians* by *S. Ambrose*, that of *Tatianus* his *Monotessaron* by *Theodoret*. In so much, that *Bellarmin* himself confesseth; *Et si multa depravare conati sunt haeretici, tamen nunquam defuerunt Catholici, qui eorum corruptelas dexterint, & non permiserint libros sacros corrumpi*. That the *Catholicks* were as vigilant as the *Hereticks malicious*, and therefore could never effect their design in corrupting the *Scripture*. Besides, it is observable, that among those multitudes of various *lections* in the *New Testament*, of which *R. Stephen* made a collection out of sixteen *MSS.* of 2384. (which probably were occasioned by the general dispersion of *Copies*, and the multitudes of transcriptions by such as were either ignorant or careless) yet there are none which are material, so as to entrench upon the integrity and authority of the *Copies* as a rule of Faith and Manners; they are therefore but *racings of the skin*, but no

no n
be su
grity
take
them
retu

Y
to th
but
certa
them
can
Chri
I ho
to d
If th
we
the

Y
grap
tion
mos
We
trac
bet
on,
it.
stea
the
infl
sho
ma
the
the
jac
nab
sha
you
atte
Un
car
un
two
fed
self
of
inte
hat
con
Fai
pre
ship
lica

no wounds of any vital part. Abating therefore only what must necessarily be supposed in the multitudes of *Copies* transcribed, there is so great integrity and incorruption in those *Copies* we have, that we cannot but therein take notice of a peculiar hand of *Divine Providence* in preserving these authentic records of our Religion so safe to our dayes. But it is time now to return to you.

You would therefore perswade us, That we have no ground of certainty as to the *Copies of Scripture*, but comparing them with the *Apostles Autographa*; but I hope our former discourse hath given you a sufficient account of our certainty without seeing the *Apostles own hands*. But I pray what certainty then had the *Jews* after the Captivity, of their *Copies of the Law*? yet I cannot think you will deny them any ground of certainty in the time of *Christ* that they had the true *Copies* both of the *Law* and the *Prophets*; and I hope you will not make the *Sanhedrin*, which condemned our *Saviour* to death, to have given them their only *Infallible certainty* concerning it. If therefore the *Jews* might be certain without *Infallibility*, why may not we? for if the *Oracles of God* were committed to the *Jews* then, they are to the *Christians* now.

You yet further urge, That there can be no certainty concerning the *Autographa's of the Apostles*, but by tradition: And may not every universal tradition be carried up as clearly at least to the *Apostles times*, as the *Scriptures*; by most credible Authors, who wrote in their respective succeeding ages? I answer, We grant there can be no certainty as to the *Copies of Scripture* but from tradition, and if you can name any of those great things in Controversie between us, which you will undertake to prove to be as universal a tradition, as that of the *Scriptures*; you and I shall not differ as to the belief of it. But think not to fob us off with the tradition of the present Church instead of the Church of all ages, with the tradition of your Church instead of the *Catholic*, with the ambiguous testimonies of two or three of the *Fathers*, instead of the universal consent of the Church since the *Apostles times*. If I should once see you prove the *Infallibility of your Church*, the *Pope's Supremacy*, *Invocation of Saints*, *Veneration of Images*, the necessity of *Celibate in the Clergy*, a punitive *Purgatory*, the lawfulness of communicating in one kind, the expediency of the *Scriptures and Prayers being in an unknown tongue*, the sacrifice of the *Mass*, *Transubstantiation* (to name no more) by as unquestionable and universal a tradition as that whereby we receive the *Scriptures*, I shall extol you for the only person that ever did any thing considerable on your side, and I shall willingly yield my self up as a *Trophy* to your brave attempts. Either then for ever forbear to mention any such things, as *Universal Tradition among you* as to any things, besides *Scriptures*, which carry a necessity with them of being believed or practised; or once for all undertake this task, and manifest it as to the things in Controversie between us. Your next Paragraph (besides what hath been already discussed in this Chapter concerning *Apostolical tradition of Scripture*) empties it self into the old *mare mortuum* of the formal object and *Infallible application of Faith*, which I cannot think my self so much at leisure to follow you into, so often as you fall into it. When once you bring any thing that hath but the least resemblance of reason more than before, I shall afresh consider it, but not till then. What next follows concerning resolving Faith into prime *Apostolical Tradition* infallibly, without the *Infallibility of the present Church*, hath been already prevented by telling you, that his Lordship doth not say, That the *infallible Resolution of Faith is into that Apostolical Tradition*, but into the *Doctrine which is conveyed in the books of Scripture*

S. 8.

P. 83.

P. 84. *from the Apostles times down to us, by an unquestionable Tradition.* Your stale Objection, *That when we should want Divine Certainty, hath been over and over answered;* and so hath your next Paragraph, *That if the Church be not infallible, we cannot be infallibly certain, that Scripture is God's Word:* and so the remainder concerning *Canonical Books.* It is an easie matter to write great Books after that rate, to swell up your discourses with needless repetitions; but it is the misery that attends a *bad cause, and a bad stomach,* to have *unconcocted things* brought up so often, till we *nauseate* them.

§. 9. Your next offer is at the *Vindication* of the noted place of *S. Austin*, *I would not believe the Gospel, &c. which (you say) cannot rationally be understood of Novices, Weaklings, and Doubters in the Faith.* This being then the place at every turn objected by you, and having before reserved the discussion of it to this place, I shall here particularly and thoroughly consider the meaning of it. In order to which, three things must be enquired into.

1. *What the Controversie was which S. Austin was there discussing of?*
2. *What that Church was which S. Austin was moved by the Authority of?*
3. *In what way and manner that Churches Authority did persuade him?*

1. Nothing seems more necessary for understanding the meaning of this place, than a true state of the *Controversie*, which *S. Austin* was disputing of; and yet nothing less spoke to on either side, than this hath been. We are therefore to consider, that when *Manes* or *Marichæus* began to appear in the world, to broach that strange and absurd Doctrine of his in the *Christian world*, which he had received from *Terebinthus* or *Buddas*, as he from *Scythianus* (who, if we believe *Epiphanius*, went to *Jerusalem* in the *Apostles times*, to enquire into the Doctrine of Christianity, and dispute with the *Christians* about his Opinions) but easily foreseeing what little entertainment so strange a complexion of absurdities would find in the *Christian world*, as long as the writings of the *Apostles* and *Evangelists* were received every where with that esteem and veneration: Two waies he, or his more cunning Disciples, bethought themselves of, whereby to lessen the authority of those writings, and so make way for the Doctrine of *Manichæus*. One was to disparage the *Credulity* of *Christians*, because the *Catholic Church* insisted so much on the necessity of *Faith*, whereas they pretended they would desire Men to believe nothing but what they gave them sufficient reason for. But all this while, since the *Christians* thought they had evident reason for believing the *Scriptures*, and consequently none to believe the Doctrine which did oppose them; therefore they found it necessary to go further, and to charge those *Copies* of *Scripture* with falsifications and corruptions, which were generally received among *Christians*. But these are fully delivered by *S. Austin* in his Book *de utilitate credendi*, as will appear to any one who looks into it; but the latter is that which

Epiph. hæ. ref. 66.
 Nihil mihi videtur ab iis impudentius dici, vel ut mitius loquar, incuriosius & imbecillius, quam Scripturas divinas esse corruptas, cum id nullis, in tam recenti memoria, extantibus exemplaribus possint convincere. D. August. de Utilit. cred. c. 3.

I aim at; this he therefore taxeth them for, *That with a great deal of impudence, or, to speak mildly, with much weakness, they charged the Scriptures to be corrupted; and yet could not at so small a distance of time prove any corruption by any Copies which were extant.* For, saith he, if they should say,

They would not embrace their writings, because they were written by such who were not careful of writing Truth, their evasion would be more shy, and their error more pardonable. But thus, it seems, they did by the *Acts* of the *Apostles*, utterly denying them to contain matter of Truth in them; and the reason was very obvious for it, because that *Book* gives so clear an account of the sending the *Spirit* upon the *Apostles*, which the *Manichæes* pretended

pretended was to be only accomplished in the Person of *Manichæus*. And both before and after, *St. Austin* mentions it as their common speech, *That before the time of Manichæus, there had been corrupters of the sacred Books, who had mixed several things of their own with what was written by the Apostles.* And this they laid upon the *Judaizing Christians*, because their great *Pique* was against the *Old Testament*, and probably some further reason might be from the *Nazarene Gospel*; wherein many things were inserted by such as did *Judaize*. The same thing *St. Austin* chargeth them with, when he gives an account of their *Heresie*. And this likewise appears by the management of the dispute between *St. Austin* and *Faustus*, who was much the subtillest Man among them. *Faustus* acknowledged no more to be Gospel, than what contained the *Doctrine* delivered by our Saviour, and therefore denied the *Genealogies* to be any part of the Gospel; and afterwards disputes against them, both in *St. Matthew*, and *St. Luke*. And after this *St. Austin* notes it as their usual custome, when they could not avoid a *Testimony of Scripture*, to deny it. Thus we see what kind of Persons these were, and what their pretences were which *St. Austin* disputes against, *They embraced so much of Scripture, as pleased them, and no more.* To this therefore *St. Austin* returns these very substantial Answers, *That if such proceedings might be admitted, the Divine Authority of any Books could signifie nothing at all for the convincing of Errors.* That it was much more reasonable, either with the *Pagans*, to deny the whole Bible, or with the *Jews*, to deny the New Testament, than thus to acknowledge in general the Books Divine, and to quarrel with such particular passages as pinched them most; that if there were any suspicion of corruption, they ought to produce more true Copies, and more ancient Books than theirs, or else be judged by the Original Languages, with many other things to the same purpose. To apply this now to the present place in dispute, *St. Austin* in that Book against the *Epistle of Manichæus*, begins with the Preface to it, which is made in imitation of the *Apostles strain*, and begins thus, *Manichæus Apostolus Jesu Christi, providentiâ Dei Patris, &c.* To this *St. Austin* saith, he believes no such thing, as that *Manichæus* was an *Apostle of Jesus Christ*, and hopes they will not be angry with him for it; for he had learned of them not to believe without reason. And therefore desires them to prove it: *It may be (saith he) one of you may read me the Gospel, and thence perswade me to believe it. But, what if you should meet with one, who, when you read the Gospel, should say to you, I do not believe it? But, I should not believe the Gospel, if the Authority of the Church did not move me: Whom therefore I obey in saying, Believe the Gospel, should I not obey in saying, Believe not Manichæus?* The Question, we see, is concerning the proving the *Apostleship of Manichæus*, which cannot in it self be proved, but from some Records, which must specifie such an *Apostleship* of his; and to any one who should question the *Authenticallness* of those Records, it can only be proved by the *Testimony and Consent of the Catholick Church*, without which *St. Austin* professeth, he should never have believed the Gospel, i. e. that these were the only true and undoubted Records, which are left us of the *Doctrine and Actions*

Quam multa soleant dicere immixta esse scripturis divinis, à nescio quibus corruptoribus veritatis.

Volunt enim nescio quos corruptores divinarum librorum ante ipsius Manichæi tempora fuisse. Id. ib.

Corrupisse autem illos, qui Judæorum legem Evangelio miscere cupiebant.

Ipsiusq; Novi Testamenti Scripturas tanquam infalsas ita legunt, ut quod voluerint inde accipiant, quod nolunt rejiciant. Aug. hæres. 46.

Evangelium quidem à prædicatione Christi esse cepit & nominari: at verò Genealogia adeo non est Evangelium, ut nec ipse ejus scriptor ausus fuerit eam Evangelium nominare. Faustus apud August. c. Faustum. l. 2. init. l. 3. init. l. 5. init.

Ubi sic manifestâ veritate isti præfocantur ut obfessi de lucidis verbis Sanctorum Scripturarum, exitum in iis fallaciâ suâ reperire non possint: id testimonium, quod prolatum est, falsum esse respondent. c. Faustum. l. 11. c. 2.

Qua auctoritas literarum aperiri, quis sacri liber evolvi, quod documentum cujuscumque Scriptura ad convincendos errores exeri potest, si hac vox admittitur, si alicujus ponderis asstimatur? Id. ib.

Si ergo invenires aliquem, qui Evangelio nondum credis, quid faceres dicenti tibi, Non credo? Ego verò Evangelio non crederem, nisi me Catholica ecclesia commoveret auctoritas. Quibus ergo obtemperavi dicentibus, Credite Evangelio, cur eis non obtemperem dicentibus mihi, Noli credere Manichæo? c. Ep. Fund. am. c. 5.

of *Christ*. And he had very good reason to say so; for otherwise the *Authority of those Books* should be questioned every time any one, such as *Manichæus*, should pretend himself an *Apostle*: Which Controversies there can be no other way of deciding, but by the *Testimony of the Church*, which hath received and embraced these *Copies* from the time of their first publishing. And that this was *St. Austin's* meaning, will appear by several parallel places in his *Disputes* against the *Manichees*. For in the same Chapter, speaking concerning the *Acts of the Apostles*, Which Book

Cui libro necesse est me credere, si credo Evangelio; quoniam utramque Scripturam similiter mihi Catholica commendat auctoritas. ib.

(saith he) *I must believe, as well as the Gospel, because the same Catholick Authority commends both: i. e. The same Testimony of the Universal Church*, which delivers the

Gospel as the authentick writings of the Evangelists, doth likewise deliver the *Acts of the Apostles for an authentick writing of one of the same Evangelists*: So that there can be no reason to believe the one, and not the other. So when he disputes against *Faustus*, who denied the truth of some things in *St. Paul's Epistles*; he bids him shew a *truer Copy* than that the *Catholick Church* received, which *Copy*, if he should produce, he desires to know how he would prove it to be *truer* to one that should deny it. *What would you do?*

Quid ages? quò te convertes? quam libri à te prolati originem, quam vetustatem, quam seriem successionis testem citabis? Aug. c. Faustum, l. 11. c. 2.

Et rides in hac re quid Ecclesiæ Catholicæ valeat auctoritas, quæ ab ipsis fundatissimis sedibus Apostolorum usque ad hodiernum diem succedentium sibi met. Episcoporum serie, & tot populorum consensione firmatur. Id. ib.

Ita si de fide exemplarium questio vertetur sicut in nonnullis, quæ & pauca sunt & Sacrarum Literarum studiosis notissime sententiarum varietates, vel ex aliarum Regionum codicibus, unde ipsa Doctrina commearit, nostra dubitatio dijudicetur: vel, si tibi quoque codices variarent, plures paucioribus, aut vetustiores recentioribus præferrentur: & si adhuc incerta varietas, præcedens lingua unde illud interpretatum est consuleretur. Id. ib.

(saith he) *Whither would you turn your self? What Original of your Book could you shew? What Antiquity, what Testimony of a succession of Persons from the time of the writing of it? But on the contrary, What huge advantage the Catholicks have, who, by a constant Succession of Bishops in the Apostolical Sees, and by the consent of so many People, have the Authority of the Church confirmed to them for the clearing the validity of its Testimony concerning the Records of Scripture*. And after lays down Rules for the trying of *Copies*, where there appears any difference between them, viz. *by comparing them with the Copies of other Countries, from whence the Doctrine originally came; and if those Copies vary too, the more Copies should be preferred before the fewer, the ancients before the latter: If yet any uncertainty remains, the original Language must be consulted*. This is, in case a Question ariseth among the acknowledged authentical *Copies of the Catholick Church* (in which case we see, he never

sends Men to the *Infallible Testimony of the Church*, for certainty as to the *Truth of the Copies*) but if the Question be, Whether any *writing* it self be *authentical* or no, then it stands to the greatest reason, that the *Testimony of the Catholick Church* should be relied on, which, by reason of its *large spread*, and continual *Succession* from the very time of those *writings*, cannot but give the most indubitable *Testimony concerning the Authenticalness of the Writings of the Apostles and Evangelists*. And were it not for this *Testimony*, *St. Austin* might justly say, *He should not believe the Gospel, i. e.* Suppose those writings which contain the *Gospel* in them (for it is plain he speaks of *them*, and not the *Doctrine* abstractly considered) should have wanted that *consent of the Catholick Church*, that it had not been delivered down by a constant succession of all Ages from the *Apostles*, and were not received among the *Christian Churches*, but started out from a few Persons who differ from all *Christian Churches*, as this *Apostleship of Manichæus* did; he might justly question the *Truth* of them. And this I take to be the truest and most natural account of these so much controverted words of *St. Austin*; by which sense the other two Questions are easily answered: For it is plain, *St. Austin* means

means not the judgment of the present Church, but of the Catholick Church, in the most comprehensive sense, as taking in all *Ages and Places*, or in *Vincentius* his words, *Succession, Universality, and Consent*; and it further appears, that the influence which this Authority hath, is sufficient to induce Assent to the thing attested in all Persons who consider it, in what Age, Capacity, or Condition soever. And therefore, if in this sense you extend it beyond *Novices and Weaklings*, I shall not oppose you in it; but it cannot be denied, that it is intended chiefly for *doubters in the Faith*, because the design of it is to give Men satisfaction as to the *reason* why they ought to believe. But neither you, nor any of those you call *Catholick Authors*, will ever be able to prove, that *St. Austin* by these words ever dreamt of any *Infallible Authority in the present Church*, as might be abundantly proved from the Chapter foregoing, where he gives an account of his being in the *Catholick Church*, from the *Consent of People and Nations*, from that *Authority which was begun by Miracles, nourished by Hope, increased by Charity, confirmed by continuance*, which certainly are not the expressions of one who resolved his Faith into the *Infallible Testimony of the present Church*. And the whole scope and design of this Book *de utilitate credendi*, doth evidently refute any such apprehension, as might be easily manifested, were it not too large a subject for this place, where we only examine the meaning of *St. Austin* in another Book. The substance of which is, that that Speech of his doth not contain a *Resolution of his Faith*, as to the *Divinity of Christ's Doctrine*; but the *resolution* of it, as to the *Truth and Authenticalness* of the *Writings of the Apostles and Evangelists*, which we acknowledge to be into the *Testimony of the Catholick Church*, in the most large and comprehensive sense.

The next thing we come to consider, is, an Absurdity you charge on his Lordship, viz. *That if the Infallible Authority of the Church be not admitted in the Resolution, he must have recourse to the private Spirit, which (say you) though he would seem to exclude from the state of the Question, yet he falls into it under the specious Title of Grace; so that he only changeth the words, but admits the same thing, for which you cite, p. 83, 84. That therein his Lordship should aver, that where others used to say, They were infallibly resolved that Scripture was God's Word, by the Testimony of the Spirit within them, that he hath the same assurance of Grace.* Whether you be not herein guilty of abusing his Lordship by a plain perverting of his meaning, will be best seen by producing his words. *A Man (saith he) is probably led by the Authority of the present Church, as by the first informing, inducing, perswading means, to believe the Scripture to be the Word of God: But, when he hath studied, considered, and compared this Word with it self, and with other Writings, with the help of ordinary Grace, and a mind morally induced, and reasonably perswaded by the Voice of the Church, the Scripture then gives greater and higher Reasons of Credibility to it self, than Tradition alone could give. And then he that believes, resolves his last and full assent, that Scripture is of Divine Authority, into internal Arguments found in the Letter it self, though found by the help and direction of Tradition without, and Grace within.* Had you not a great mind to calumniate, who could pick out of these words, *That the Bishop resolved his Faith into Grace*? Can any thing be more plain, than the contrary is from them, when in the most perspicuous terms he says, *that the last Resolution of Faith is internal Arguments, and only supposeth Tradition and Grace as necessary helps for the finding them*? Might you not then as well have said, *That his Lordship, notwithstanding his Zeal against the Infallibility of Tradition, is said to resolve his Faith into it at last, as well as say, that he doth it into Grace*; for

S. 19.
P. 85. n. 2.

P. 83.

for he joyns these two together? But, it is not possible to assert the Use and Necessity of Grace, in order to Faith, but the last Resolution of it must be into it? Do not all your Divines, as well as ours, suppose and prove the Necessity of Grace, in order to believing; and, Are they not equally guilty of having recourse to the private Spirit? Do you really think your self, that there is any thing of Divine Grace in Faith or no? If there be, free your Self then from the private Spirit, and you do his Lordship. For shame then forbear such pitiful Calumnies; which, if they have any truth in them, You are as much concerned as Your Adversary in it. You would next persuade us, That the Relator never comes near the main difficulty, which (say you) is, if the Church be supposed fallible in the Tradition of Scripture, how it shall be certainly known, whether de facto, she now errs not in her delivery of it? If this be your grand Difficulty, it is sufficiently assailed already, having largely answered this Question *in terminis*, in the preceding Chapter.

You ask further, What they are to do who are unresolved which is the true Church; as though it were necessary for Men to know which is the true Church, before they can believe the Scriptures to be the Word of God? But when we assert the Tradition of the Church to be necessary for believing the Scriptures, we do not thereby understand the particular Tradition of any particular Church whose judgment they must rely on, but the Universal Tradition of all Christians, though this must be first made known in some particular Society, by the means of some particular Persons, though their Authority doth not oblige us to believe, but only are the means whereby Men come acquainted with that Universal Tradition. And therefore your following Discourse concerning the knowing the true Church by its Motives is superseded; for we mean no other Church than the Community of Christians in this Controversie; and, if you ask me, By what Motives I come to be certain which is a Community of Christians, and which of Mahometans, and how one should be known from another, I can soon resolve you: But we are so far from making it necessary to know which particular Society of Christians in opposition to others, is the true Church for resolving this Question, that we look on it as a great argument of the Credibility as well as Universality of this Tradition, that all these differing Societies consent in it. And not only they, but the greatest opposers of Christianity, Jews, or Philosophers, could never see any reason to call in question such a Tradition.

His Lordship the better to represent the use of Tradition in the last resolution of Faith makes use of this Illustration, That as the knowledge of Grammar and Logick is necessary in order to the making a Demonstration, yet the knowledge of the Conclusion is not resolved into Grammar or Logick, but into the immediate Principles out of which it is deduced: So a Man's first Preparative to Faith is the Churches Tradition, but his full and last assent is resolved into the internal Arguments of Scripture. This you quarrel with, and tell us, There is not the same Analogy between Logick and Church-Tradition; your meaning, I suppose is, because Logick doth Physically by enlarging the Understanding fit Men for Demonstrations, but Church-Tradition cannot enable Men to understand the Scripture. But cannot you easily discern that Analogy which his Lordship brought this Illustration for, which is, that some things may be necessary Preparations for Knowledge, which that Knowledge is not resolved into. Is not this plain in Logick, and is it not as plain between Tradition and Scripture? For though Tradition doth not open our Eyes to see this Light, yet it presents the Object to us to be seen, and that in an unquestionable manner. But for all this, say you, a Man must either receive it on the sole Authority of Church-Tradition, or
be

be as much in the dark as ever, Why so? Is there any repugnancy in the thing, that Scripture should be received first upon the account of Tradition, and yet afterwards Men resolve their Faith into the Scripture it self? May not a Man very probably believe that a *Diamond* is sent him from a Friend upon the testimony of the *Messenger* who brings it, and yet be firmly perswaded of it, by discerning the *Sparklings* of it? But, say you further, *The Scriptures themselves appear no more to be the Word of God, than the Stars to be of a certain determinate number, or the distinction of colours to a blind Man.* If this approach not to the highest blasphemy against the Scripture, I know not what doth. He that shall compare this saying of yours, with that in the precedent Chapter, *That if Christ had not left the Church Infallible, he might be accounted an Impostor and Deceiver*, may easily guess how much of Religion you believe in your heart, when on so small occasions you do so openly disparage both *Christ* and the *Scriptures*. It is well yet, your *Churches* Infallibility can stand on no better terms than these are; which will be sufficient to keep any who have any true sense of the truth and excellency of *Christ* and the *Scriptures* from hearkening to it. But are you in good earnest when you say, that *Scriptures themselves appear no more to be the Word of God, than the distinction of colours to a blind Man*, which is as much as nothing at all? Is there nothing at all in the excellency of the *Doctrine* and *Precepts* contained in the *Scriptures*, nothing in those clear discoveries of God and our selves, nothing in all those transactions between God and Men, nothing in that *Covenant* of Redemption between God and Man through *Christ*, nothing in the clear accomplishment and fulfilling of *Prophecies*, nothing in that admirable strain and style which is in the writings, nothing in that harmonious consent which is discovered in writers of several ages, interests, places, and conditions, nothing in that admirable efficacy which the *Doctrine* of it hath upon the souls of Men to perswade them to renounce sin, the world, and themselves for the sake of it; is there nothing more (I say) in all these, which makes the Scripture appear to be the Word of God, than the distinction of colours to a blind Man? Could you as soon think to account the stars as discern any thing of Divinity from these things in the *Scriptures*? If your eyes were as blind as your understanding, could you as soon distinguish white from black, as the Scripture from the *Alcoran*, if they were both presented to you to read, and judge of them according to the evidence you found in them? Is it possible a Man that owns himself a *Christian*, should utter such opprobrious language of the Scripture? You had been before speaking what honour you give to the Scripture, notwithstanding you pretend your *Church* Infallible, and I had mentioned some of those passages which occur in your writers in disparagement of them: but I must needs say they all fall short of this; the *Nose of Wax*, the *Inky Divinity*, the *Lesbian rule*, are Courtlike expressions to this of yours; for this puts no difference in the world between the Scripture and the *Alcoran*, if your *Church* should propound the one as well as the other. For you could not possibly say worse of the *Alcoran*, than that of it self it appears no more to be the Word of God, than distinction of colours to a blind Man. I might here send you to be chastised for this insolent Atheistical expression to the Primitive Fathers, who speak so much in admiration of the excellency of *Scriptures*, who did vindicate them from all assaults of the *Heathen Philosophers*. I might send you to those of your own party, who if they have any love or tenderness for *Christian Religion* will not suffer such passages to pass without the most severe rebukes: I might sufficiently prove the contrary from the arguments used against *Atheists* by *Belarmine* and others; but I shall

content

Cum multa sint in ipsâ Doctrinâ Christianâ quæ ipsa per se fidem illi & auctoritatem conciliare possint, tamen mihi maximum illud esse videtur, (ut à Clement. Alex. & à Lactant, & ab aliis est observatum) quod suâ nescio qua admirabili vi, divinè prorsus hominum animos afficit, atque ad virtutem impellit. Est scripta verbis simplicibus, & caret se: è artificio orationis & ornamentis; nihilominus ita vehementer lectoris mentem commovet, ut nulla alia doctrina. Quod argumento est, illius auctoritatem omnino Divinam esse, & non humanam; hæc enim sine verborum arte, & orationis quasi lenociniis, ad efficiendum animorum motum non valet. Greg. de Valentia, Analyf. fidei. l. 1. c. 25.

content my self with that noble and Christian confession of your Gregory de Valentia, from whom you might learn more piety and modesty towards the Sacred Scriptures. *There being many things in the Doctrine of Christianity it self, which of themselves may conciliate belief and authority, yet that seems the greatest to me (as hath been observed by Clement of Alexandria, Lactantius and others) that I know not with what admirable force, but most divine, it affects the hearts of Men, and stirs them up to vertue. It is written with great simplicity, and without almost any artifice or ornament of speech; which is an argument that its authority is not humane but Divine, for no humane writing hath any power on the minds of Men without a great deal of art*

and eloquence How many things are there in this ingenuous and pious confession of this learned Jesuite, which might, if you have any shame left, make you sensible of the Blasphemy of your former expression? For, 1. He saith, there are many things in the doctrine of Christianity which for themselves may conciliate our belief, and manifest their authority: If for themselves then certainly the Scriptures of themselves have a great deal more evidence, that they are the Word of God, than the distinction of colours to a blind Man. 2. That the peculiar strain and genius of Scripture argues something Divine in it, because, notwithstanding its simplicity it hath so great power and efficacy on the minds of Men; far beyond any humane art or Rhetorick. 3. That this may be discerned in the very Books of Scripture without the supposition of the authority of any Church; for he mentions the Doctrine meerly as written, and what may be found by the reading of it. Go then, and learn some piety and ingenuity (where it is so seldome to be learned) from a Jesuite, and think not that we shall ever have the meaner thoughts of the Scripture for such bold expressions; but, we can easily see, that the Infallibility of the Church, and the Honour of Scripture cannot possibly stand together.

Your subsequent discourse consists of some rare pieces of subtilty, which may be resolved into these consequences: If your Church of Rome hath erred as to the number of Canonical Books, then the Catholick Church, ever since Christ's time, hath erred; if the Church may erre, then we cannot be certain but she hath erred; if we can have no infallible certainty, then we can have none at all; These consequences your discourse to n. 5. may be resolved into; and make good ever a one of them, I will say you have proved something; which is more than you have done yet.

S. 11.
P. 87.

N. 5. You object against his Lordship, *That he requires so many things in order to the resolution of Faith, that he makes none capable of it, but Men of extraordinary parts and learning.* To which I answer, that his Lordship is not undertaking to give an account of the Faith of rude or illiterate persons, but such a one as may satisfy Men of parts and learning, i. e. he endeavoured to lay down the true rational account of it, and not to enquire how far God obligeth every Man that comes to Heaven, to a critical Resolution of his Faith. And therefore for the generality of such persons who heartily believe the Truth of Scriptures, but are not able to give a clear and satisfactory account of it to others; I answer, as S. Austin did in the same case, *Ceteram quippe turbam non intelligendi vivacitas, sed credendi simplicitas tutissimam facit*: That God requires not from the common sort of

Aug. c. ep.
Fund. c. 4.

of believers, the *subtlety of Speculation*, but the *simplicity of Faith*; which may be very firm even in them from the reading of *Scripture*, and hearing the *Doctrine* of it plainly delivered to them, though they are not able to give such accounts of their Faith, which may be satisfactory to any but themselves. So we say, *That the way is so plain, that mean capacities may not err therein.* But, I wonder at you, of all Men, that you should charge our way with *Intricacy*, who lead men into such perplexities and difficulties, before they can be satisfied that they ought to believe. For to this end you make the *Infalible Testimony* of the *Church* necessary; and, how many insuperable difficulties are there before one can be assured of that? First, he must know your *Church* to be the *True Church*, and this must be proved by a continual *succession* of *Pastors* in your *Church*, and by a *conformity* of your *Doctrine* with the *Ancients*; and, Do you think these two are not very easie Introductions to *Faith*, like the taking *Rome* in ones way, to go from *York* to *London*; but, though a Man should pull down a *House* to find a *Key* to open it, and after he had searched in all the rubbish of *Antiquity*, find enough to perswade him you may be a *True Church*, yet he is as far from believing as ever, unless he finds a way through another *Trap-door* for his *Faith*, which is, that *your*, though a particular *Church*, is yet the only *Catholick Church*, i. e. that the first room he comes in, is *infalibly* the *whole House*, and therefore he never needs look further. But, supposing this, yet if he doth not believe this *Church* to be *Infalible* in all it says, he had as good never come into it, and therefore he must believe strenuously, *That whatever it says, is infalibly true*, which being so hard a task, (as for a Man that sees a *House* built before his eyes, to believe it can never fall) it had need have some good *Barrelles* to support it, and at last finds nothing but some feeble *Kittles of Credibility*, which signifie nothing as to the *Church*, but might have been strong enough, if set in the right place, viz. not to support the *Church*, but to prove the truth of *Christian Doctrine*. These, and many other *Intrigues*, which I have formerly discovered, do unavoidably attend the resolution of your *Faith*, among all Persons who profess to believe on the account of your *Churches Infalibility*.

What follows next concerning *Grace*, is already answered. What certainty we have that *Scripture* is of *Divine Revelation*, and consequently what obligation lies upon Men to believe it, are things largely discoursed on in the beginning of this Chapter; and I shall suppose sufficiently cleared, till you shew me reason to the contrary: By which it will appear (contrary to what follows n. 6.) that we have the *highest Reasons* or *Motives of Credibility*, to assent to the *Truth*, and *Divine Authority* of the *Scriptures*.

But you proceed to an attempt of something new; which is, in a long harangue to disprove his Lordship's Opinion of *resolving Faith* into that *Divine Light* which appears in *Scripture*. This you insist on from n. 6. to n. 8. the substance of all which discourse, I suppose, may be reduced to these three things, 1. *That though the Scripture be called a Light, yet that it is to be understood only of those who own its authority.* 2. *That the Scripture cannot shew it self to be an infalible Light.* 3. *That if there were such Light in Scripture, all others would see it as well as he.* Before I come to a particular handling of each of these, it will be necessary to consider, What it is which his Lordship means by this *Divine Light* in *Scripture*; for, there is nothing causeth more confusion in the discourses and apprehensions of Men, than the applying *Metaphors* taken from the *sense* to the *acts* of the *Understanding*.

Cum multa sint in ipsâ Doctrinâ Christianâ quæ ipsa per se fidem illi & autoritatem conciliare possint, tamen mihi maximum illud esse videtur, (ut à Clement. Alex. & à Lactant, & ab aliis est observatum) quod sua nescio qua admirabili vi, divinè prorsus hominum animos afficit, atque ad virtutem impellit. Est scripta verbis simplicibus, & caret se è artificio orationis & ornamentis; nihilominus ita vehementer lectoris mentem commovet, ut nulla alia doctrina. Quod argumento est, illius autoritatem omnino Divinam esse, & non humanam; hæc enim sine verborum arte, & orationis quasi lenociniis, ad efficiendum animorum motum non valet. Greg. de Valentia, Analyf. fidei. l. 1. c. 25.

content my self with that noble and Christian confession of your *Gregory de Valentia*, from whom you might learn more piety and modesty towards the Sacred Scriptures. *There being many things in the Doctrine of Christianity it self, which of themselves may conciliate belief and authority, yet that seems the greatest to me (as hath been observed by Clement of Alexandria, Lactantius and others) that I know not with what admirable force, but most divine, it affects the hearts of Men, and stirs them up to vertue. It is written with great simplicity, and without almost any artifice or ornament of speech; which is an argument that its authority is not humane but Divine, for no humane writing hath any power on the minds of Men without a great deal of art*

and eloquence How many things are there in this ingenuous and pious confession of this learned *Jesuite*, which might, if you have any shame left, make you sensible of the Blasphemy of your former expression? For, 1. He saith, there are many things in the doctrine of Christianity which for themselves may conciliate our belief, and manifest their authority: If for themselves then certainly the Scriptures of themselves have a great deal more evidence, that they are the Word of God, than the distinction of colours to a blind Man. 2. That the peculiar strain and genius of Scripture argues something Divine in it, because, notwithstanding its simplicity it hath so great power and efficacy on the minds of Men; far beyond any humane art or Rhetorick. 3. That this may be discerned in the very Books of Scripture without the supposition of the authority of any Church; for he mentions the Doctrine meerly as written, and what may be found by the reading of it. Go then, and learn some piety and ingenuity (where it is so seldome to be learned) from a *Jesuite*, and think not that we shall ever have the meaner thoughts of the Scripture for such bold expressions; but, we can easily see, that the Infallibility of the Church, and the Honour of Scripture cannot possibly stand together.

Your subsequent discourse consists of some rare pieces of subtilty, which may be resolved into these consequences: If your Church of Rome hath erred as to the number of Canonical Books, then the Catholick Church, ever since Christ's time, hath erred; if the Church may erre, then we cannot be certain but she hath erred; if we can have no infallible certainty, then we can have none at all; These consequences your discourse to n. 5. may be resolved into; and make good ever a one of them, I will say you have proved something; which is more than you have done yet.

S. 11.
P. 87.

N. 5. You object against his Lordship, *That he requires so many things in order to the resolution of Faith, that he makes none capable of it, but Men of extraordinary parts and learning.* To which I answer, that his Lordship is not undertaking to give an account of the Faith of rude or illiterate persons, but such a one as may satisfy Men of parts and learning, i. e. he endeavoured to lay down the true rational account of it, and not to enquire how far God obligeth every Man that comes to Heaven, to a critical Resolution of his Faith. And therefore for the generality of such persons who heartily believe the Truth of Scriptures, but are not able to give a clear and satisfactory account of it to others; I answer, as *S. Austin* did in the same case, *Ceteram quippe turbam non intelligendi vivacitas, sed credendi simplicitas tutissimam facit*: That God requires not from the common sort

Aug. c. ep.

Fund. c. 4.

of

of believers, the *subtlety of Speculation*, but the *simplicity of Faith*; which may be very firm even in them from the reading of *Scriptures*, and hearing the *Doctrine* of it plainly delivered to them, though they are not able to give such accounts of their Faith, which may be satisfactory to any but themselves. So we say, *That the way is so plain, that mean capacities may not err therein.* But, I wonder at you, of all Men, that you should charge our way with *Intricacy*, who lead Men into such perplexities and difficulties, before they can be satisfied that they ought to believe; for to this end you make the *Infallible Testimony* of the Church necessary; and, how many insuperable difficulties are there before one can be assured of that? First, he must know your Church to be the *True Church*, and this must be proved by a continual *succession* of *Pastors* in your Church, and by a *conformity* of your *Doctrine* with the *Ancients*; and, Do you think these two are not very easie Introductions to *Faith*, like the taking Rome in ones way, to go from York to London; but, though a Man should pull down a House to find a Key to open it, and after he had searched in all the rubbish of *Antiquity*, find enough to perswade him yours may be a *True Church*, yet he is as far from believing as ever, unless he finds a way through another *Trap-door* for his *Faith*, which is, that yours, though a particular Church, is yet the only *Catholick Church*, i. e. that the first room he comes in, is *infallibly* the whole House, and therefore he never needs look further. But, supposing this, yet if he doth not believe this Church to be *Infallible* in all it says, he had as good never come into it; and therefore he must believe strenuously, *That whatever it says, is infallibly true*, which being so hard a task, (as for a Man that sees a House half down before his eyes, to believe it can never fall) it had need have some good *Buttresses* to support it, and at last finds nothing but some feeble *Motives of Credibility*, which signifie nothing as to the Church, but might have been strong enough, if set in the right place, viz. not to support the Church, but to prove the truth of Christian Doctrine. These, and many other *Intrigues*, which I have formerly discovered, do unavoidably attend the resolution of your *Faith*, among all Persons who profess to believe on the account of your Churches *Infallibility*.

What follows next concerning *Grace*, is already answered: What certainty we have that *Scripture* is of *Divine Revelation*, and consequently what obligation lies upon Men to believe it, are things largely discoursed on in the beginning of this Chapter; and I shall suppose sufficiently cleared, till you shew me reason to the contrary: By which it will appear (contrary to what follows n. 6.) that we have the *highest Reasons* or *Motives of Credibility*, to assent to the *Truth*, and *Divine Authority* of the *Scriptures*.

But you proceed to an attempt of something new; which is, in a long harangue to disprove his Lordship's Opinion of *resolving Faith* into that *Divine Light* which appears in *Scripture*. This you insist on from n. 6. to n. 8. the substance of all which discourse, I suppose, may be reduced to these three things. 1. *That though the Scripture be called a Light, yet that is to be understood only of those who own its authority.* 2. *That the Scripture cannot shew it self to be an Infallible Light.* 3. *That if there were such Light in Scripture, all others would see it as well as he.* Before I come to a particular handling of each of these, it will be necessary to consider, What it is which his Lordship means by this *Divine Light* in *Scripture*; for, there is nothing causeth more confusion in the discourses and apprehensions of Men, than the applying *Metaphors* taken from the *sense* to the *acts* of the *Understanding*.

ding : For, by this means, we are apt to judge of our intellectual acts in a way wholly suitable to those of *sense*. We are not therefore to conceive, there can be any thing in *Divine Truths*, which so immediately doth discover it self to the mind, as *light* doth to the *eye*. But that only which bears proportion to the *light* in the Mind, is *reason* ; for Men's Minds being *discursive*, and not *intuitive*, they do not behold the truth of things by immediate *intuition*, but by such *reason* and *arguments* as do induce and perswade to assent. We are not therefore to imagine any such *Light* in Scripture, that doth as immediately work upon the Understanding, as the *Light* of the *Sun* doth on the Organs of Sight ; and therefore that common speech, that *Light* doth discover it self as well as other things, is in this sense improperly applied to the Understanding ; for, whatever is discovered to the mind in a *discursive manner*, as all Objects of Faith are, must have some antecedent *evidence* to it self, which must be the ground of the act of Assent. That therefore which is called the *Divine Light of Scripture*, is, I suppose that *rational evidence* which is contained in the *Books* of Scripture, whereby any reasonable Man may be perswaded that these *Books* are of *Divine Authority*. Now that herein I say nothing beyond or besides his Lordship's meaning and intention, will appear by his own discourse on this subject. For, 1. His Lordship designedly disproves that Opinion that

P. 69. Sect. 16. n. 10. *Scripture should be fully and sufficiently known as by Divine and Infallible Testimony, lumine proprio, by the resplendency of that Light which it hath in it self only, and by the witness that it can so give to it self.* Because, as there is no place in Scripture that tells us such Books containing such and such particulars, are the Canon and Infallible Will of God ; so, if there were any such place, that could be no sufficient proof ; for, a Man may justly ask another Book to bear witness to that, and so in infinitum. Again, this inbred Light of Scripture is a thing coincident with Scripture it self, and so the Principles and the Conclusion in this kind of proof should be entirely the same, which cannot be. Besides, if this inward Light were so clear, how could there have been any variety among the ancient Believers, touching the authority of S. James, and S. Jude's Epistles, and the Apocalypse, &c. For certainly the Light which is in the Scripture, was the same then which now it is. On these reasons then, we see, his Lordship not only disclaims, but disproves such knowing the Scripture meerly by the Light within. Two things then I hence infer, which will be very necessary to clear his Lordship's meaning. 1. That he nowhere attributes such an *inward Light* to Scripture, that by it self it can discover that these Books are from God. 2. That where his Lordship mentions this *Light* most, he supposeth *Tradition* antecedent to it, as appears by his whole Discourse. From whence I gather this to have been the plainest account of his way of resolving Faith, as I have already intimated, viz. that the *resolution* of Faith may be considered two ways ; into the Books, and into the *Doctrine* contained in them. The *resolution* into the Books, must, of necessity, suppose *Tradition*, and rely upon it ; and this kind of *Resolution* of Faith, cannot be into any *Self-evidence*, or *Internal Light* : But, supposing the Books owned on the account of *Tradition*, if the Question be concerning the *Divinity* of the *Doctrine*, then he asserts, that the *Resolution* of this is into the *Divine Light* of Scripture, i. e. into that *rational evidence* which we find of the *Divinity* of it, in these Books which are owned on the account of *Tradition*.

P. 101. n. 32. And that this is his Lordship's meaning, appears, 2. By his own Testimony, who was best able to explain himself ; for, when he goes about to confirm his Opinion by the Testimonies of the Fathers, he tells us, *This was*

was the way which the ancient Church ever used, namely, Tradition, or Ecclesiastical Authority first, and then all other arguments, but especially internal, from the Scripture it self. And, for this first, instanceth in St. Augustine, who (saith he) gives four proofs all internal to the Scripture it self, which are, First, The Miracles. Secondly, That there is nothing carnal in the Doctrine, Thirdly, Fulfilling of Prophecies. Fourthly, The Efficacy of it for Conversion of the World. All these we see he instanceth in, as internal arguments, and therefore make up that which he calls *Divine Light*. So that all that he means by this *Light of Scripture*, is only that rational evidence of the Divinity of the Doctrine, which may be discovered in it, or deduced from it.

Having thus explained his Lordship's meaning, it will be no matter of difficulty to return an Answer to the Particulars by you alledged.

1. You say, That when Scripture is said to be a Light by the Royal Prophet, it is to be understood in this sense, Because, after we have once received it from the Infallible Authority of the Church, it teacheth what we are to do and believe. But, 1. Doth not the Scripture sufficiently teach what we are to do and believe, supposing it not received on the infallible Authority of the Church? Doth that add any thing to the *Light of the Scripture*? Or, do you suppose the necessity of infallibly believing it on the Churches Authority, before one can discern what it teacheth us to do and believe?

2. What ground have you, in the least, to imagine, that David ever believed the Scripture on the Infallible Authority of the Church: That he doth suppose it to be God's Word, when he saith, It is a light to his feet, I deny not; but that he should suppose it to be so, because the Church did infallibly tell him it was so, is a most ungrounded Assertion. Had he not sufficient evidence that the Law was from God, by those many unquestionable and stupendious Miracles, which attended the delivery of it? Was not the whole Constitution and Government of the Jewish Nation, an impregnable argument that those things were true, which were recorded in their Books? Did ever the Jewish Sanhedrin, High Priest, or others, arrogate to themselves any infallible Testimony, in delivering the Books of Moses to the People? The most you can suppose of a ground of certainty among them, was from that Sacred Record of the Book of the Law, which was kept in the Ark: And how could they know that was Authentick, but from the same Tradition, which conveyed the Miracles of Moses to them? So that nothing like any infallible Authority of a Church was looked on by them as necessary to believe the Law to have been from God. 3. Supposing it from Tradition unquestionable, that the Law was from God, those incomparable directions which were in it might be a great confirmation to David's Faith, that it was his Word. Which is that he intends, in these words, *Thy Word is a light to my feet*, &c. to shew that excellency and perspicuity which was in his Word, that it gave him the best directions for ordering his Conversation. And this is all which his Lordship means, that to those, who, by the advantage of Tradition, have already venerable thoughts of Scripture; the serious conversing with it, doth highly advance them, and establish their belief of it, as that Faith is thereby clinched which was driven in by education. And therefore, when he saith, That *Light discovers its self as well as other things*, he presently adds, not till there hath been a preparing instruction what Light it is. Thus, (he saith) the Tradition of the Church is the first moral motive to belief: But the belief it self; that Scripture is the Word of God, rests upon Scripture, when a Man finds it to answer and exceed that which the Church gave in Testimony. For this his Lordship cites Origen, who, though much nearer the prime

P. 84.

Tradition than we are, yet being to prove that the Scriptures were inspired from God, he saith, *De hoc assignabimus ex ipsis Scripturis Divinis, quæ nos competenter moverint, &c.* We will mention those things out of the Sacred Scriptures, which have persuaded us, &c. To this you answer, Though Origen prove by the Scriptures themselves, that they were inspired from God; yet doth he never avow, that this could be proved out of them, unless they were received by the Infallible Authority of the Church. Which Answer is very unreasonable. For, 1. It might be justly expected that when his Lordship had produced an express Testimony to his purpose out of Origen, you should have brought some other as clear for his believing Scripture on the Churches Infallibility, which you are so far from, that you would put us to prove a Negative: But, if you will deal fairly, and as you ought to do, produce your Testimonies out of him, and the rest of the Fathers concerning your Churches Infallibility. Till then, excuse us if we take their express words, and leave you to gather Infallibility out of their latent meanings. 2. What doth your Infallibility conduce to believing Scriptures for themselves? For, you say, *The Scriptures cannot be proved by themselves to be God's Word, unless they were received by the Infallible Authority of the Church*; it seems then, if they be so received, they may be proved by themselves to be God's Word. Are those Proofs by themselves sufficient for Faith, or no? If not, they are very slender Proofs: If they be, what need your Churches Infallibility? Unless you will suppose, no Man can discern those Proofs without your Churches Testimony; and then they are not Proofs by themselves,* but from your Churches Infallibility; which may serve for one accession more to the heap of your Contradictions. His Lordship asserting the last Resolution of Faith to be into simply Divine Authority, cites that speech of *Henr. à Gandavo*, That in the Primitive Church, when the Apostles themselves spake, they did believe principally for the sake of God, and not the Apostles; from whence he infers, If, where the Apostles themselves spake, the last resolution of Faith was into God, and not into themselves on their own account; much more shall it now be into God, and not the present Church, and into the Writings of the Apostles, than into the words of their Successors made up into Tradition. All that you answer, is, That this Argument must be solved by the Bishop, as well as you, because he hath granted the Authority of the Apostles was Divine as well as you. Was there ever a more senseless Answer! Doth *Gandavo* deny the Apostles Authority to have been Divine? Nay, Doth he not imply it, when he saith, Men did not believe for the Apostles sake, but for God's, who spake by them. As *St. Paul* said, *You received our Word, not as the Word of Men, but as it is indeed the Word of God.* How the Bishop should be concerned to answer this, is beyond my skill to imagine. If Origen speaks to such as believe the Scriptures to be the Word of God; so doth the Bishop too, viz. on the account of Tradition and Education. If Origen endeavoured by those Proofs to confirm and settle their Faith, that is all the Bishop aims at, that a Faith taken up on the Churches Tradition, may be settled and confirmed by the internal Arguments of Scripture. But, how you should from this Discourse assert, That the Authority of the Church must be Infallible in delivering the Scripture, is again beyond my reach, neither can I possibly think what should bear the face of Premises to such a Conclusion. Unless it be, if Origen assert, That the Scriptures may be believed for themselves, if *Gandavo* saith, That the Resolution of Faith must be into God himself, then the Churches Authority must be Infallible; but it appears already, that the Premises are true, and what then

Orig. *de*
ap. l.
 4. C. I.
 P. 88.

Ibid.

then remains but *therefore, &c.* which may indeed be listed among your rare Argumentations for *Infallibility*.

2. *That Scripture cannot manifest it self to be an infallible Light*; the proof of which is the design of your following Discourse. Wherein you first Quarrel with the Bishop for his arguing from the Scriptures being a Light; for thence (you say) it will only follow, that the Scripture manifests it self to be a Light, which you grant, but that it should manifest it self to be an Infallible Light you deny; for (say you) unless he could shew that there are no other Lights, save the Word of God, and such as are Infallible, he can never make good his consequence. For in Seneca, Plutarch, Aristotle, you read many Lights, and those manifest themselves to be Lights; but they do not therefore manifest themselves to be Infallible Lights. The substance of your Argument lies in this, The Scripture discovers the Being of God; so doth the Talmud and Alcoran, as well as it; the Scripture delivers abundance of moral Instructions, but these may be found in multitudes of other Books, both of Christians, and Jews, and Heathens; and as we do not thence infer, that these Books are Infallible, so neither can we that the Scriptures are. This is the utmost of Sense or Reason, which I can extract out of your Discourse; which reduced into Form, will come to this. If the Scriptures contain nothing in them, but what may be found in other Books that are not Infallible, then the Scriptures cannot shew themselves to be Infallible; but the antecedent is true, and therefore the consequent. I could wish you would have taken a little more pains in proving that which must be your assumption, viz. *That Scripture contains nothing in it but what may be seen in Seneca, Plutarch, Aristotle, the Talmud, Alcoran, and other Books of Jews and Heathens.* These are rare things to assert among Christians, without offering at any more proof of them than you do, which lies in this Syllogism. If Scripture contain some things which may be seen in these Books, then it contains nothing but what may be seen in these Books; but the Scripture contains some things which may be seen in other Books, viz. the existence of God, and moral Instructions; therefore it contains nothing but what is in them. And, Do you really think that you have now proved, that there is nothing in Scripture that can shew it self to be Infallible, because some things are common to other Writings. Would you not take it very ill, that any should say that you had no more Brains than a Horse, or a Creature of a like nature, because they have Sense and Motion, as well as you? Yet this is the very same Argument whereby you would prove that the Scriptures cannot shew themselves to be Divine, because the Talmud, Alcoran, and Philosophers, have some things in them which the Scripture hath. But, Can you prove that the Scripture hath nothing else in it, but what may be found in any, or all of these Books? Will you undertake to shew any where such representations of the Being and Attributes of God, so suitable to the Conceptions which naturally flow from the Idea of a Supreme and Infinite Being, and yet those Attributes discovered in such Contrivances for Man's Good, which the wit of Man could never have reached to; above all, in the Reconciliation of the World to himself by the Death of his Son? Will you find out so exact a Rule of Piety, consisting of such excellent Precepts, such encouraging Promises as are in Scripture, in any other writings whatsoever? Can you discover any where such an unexpressible energy and force in a writing of so great simplicity and plainness as the Scripture is? Is there any thing unbecoming that Authority, which it awes the Consciences of Men with? Is there any thing mean, trivial, fabulous, and imperinent in it? Are not all things written with that infinite decorum and sui bleness,

as do highly express the *Majesty* of him from whom it comes, but in the most sweet, affable, and condescending manner? Are there any such Arguments in the Writings of *Seneca*, *Plutarch*, *Aristotle*, for the Being of God, and Immortality of Souls, as there are in Scripture? Are there any moral Instructions built on such good grounds, carried on to so high a degree, written with that life and vigour in any of the *Heathen Philosophers*, as are in the Scriptures? How infinitely do the highest of them fall short of the Scripture in those very things, which they seem most to have in common with it? As, were it here a fit place, might be at large discovered. But, besides, and beyond all these, Are there not other things which evidence the Divine Revelation of the Doctrine contained in Scripture, which none of the Writings you mention, can in the least pretend to, viz. the accurate Accomplishment of Prophecies, and the abundance of Miracles wrought for the confirmation of the Divine Testimony of those who delivered this Doctrine to the World. And these very things now to us are internal to the Scripture, the Motives of Faith being delivered to us in the same Books that the Doctrine of Faith is: In which sense the Scriptures may well be said to be proved Divine by themselves, and that they appear Infallible by the Light which is in them, notwithstanding you most pitifully pretend to the contrary. And, if your Church will again pardon you for such opprobrious language of Scripture, as not only to compare the writings of *Seneca*, *Plutarch*, and *Aristotle* with it, which yet are commendable in their kind, for moral Virtue, and natural Knowledge; but those wretched and notorious Impostures of the *Alcoran*, and the fabulous Relations of the *Talmud*; if, I say, your Church will pardon such expressions as these, because they tend to inhanse her Infallibility, well fare that Pope, who said *Heu quam minimo regitur mundus!*

As for your following instance of a Candle lighted in a room, which shews that it is a light, but not who lighted it; so the sentences in Scripture are lights, and shew themselves to be such, but they cannot shew themselves to be such Infallible Lights which are produced by none but God himself: I answer, That I commend your discretion in making choice of a Candle rather than of the Light of the Sun to set forth the Scripture by. For a Candle yields but a dim uncertain Light, may be put into a dark Lanthorn, and snuffed at pleasure; so would your Church fain pretend of the Scripture, that its Light is very weak and uncertain, that your Church must open the sides of the Lanthorn that it may give light, and make use of some Apostolical Snuffers of the Pope's keeping, to make it shine the clearer, though they often endanger the almost extinguishing of it; at least as to the generality of those who should enjoy the benefit of it. But because that poor Light of a Candle cannot shew who lighted it, Will not the Light of the Sun manifest it self to be no greater than that of a Candle? Cannot any one infer from the vast extent of that light, from the vanishing of it upon the Sun's setting, and its dispersing it self at his rising, that this light can proceed only from that great luminous body which is in the Heavens? And may we not proportionably infer, from the clearness, greatness, majesty, coherency of those truths revealed in Scripture, that they must certainly come from none but God; especially being joyned with those impregnable evidences which himself by the Persons who delivered them hath given that they were employed by himself for that end? But because this is a matter of great consequence, give me leave to propound these questions to you, and after you have considered them seriously, return me a rational answer to them. 1. Doth it imply any repugnancy at all in the nature of the thing, or to the nature of God,

God, that he should reveal his mind to the World. 2. If it doth not, as I suppose you will grant that, Whether it is possible that God should make it evident to the World that such a *Revelation* is from himself? 3. If this be not impossible, Is it not necessary that it should be so, supposing that God should require the *belief* of a *Doctrine* so revealed on *pain* of *eternal Damnation* for not believing it? 4. Whether God may not give as great evidence of a *Revelation* that he makes of his Mind to the World, as he doth of his *Being*, from the *Wisdom*, *Goodness* and *Power*, which may be seen in the *Works* of *Creation*? 5. Whether any other way be conceivable that it should be evident that a *Doctrine* comes from God, but that it contains things highly suitable to the *Divine Nature*, things above the *finding* out of *humane Reason*, things only tending to advance *Holiness* and *Goodness* in the World, and this *Doctrine* to be delivered by Persons who wrought unparallel'd *Miracles*? 6. Whether all these be not in the most evident manner imaginable contained in the *Doctrine* of *Christianity*, and in the *Books* of *Scripture*? Which I leave any Man that hath common sense to judge of? 7. Whether then it be not the highest disparagement of this *Divine Doctrine* to make it stand in need of an *Infallible Testimony* of any company who shall take the boldness to call themselves the *Catholic Church*, in order to the believing of it; and whether there can be any greater dishonour done it, than to say it hath no more light to discover it self Divine, than the *Writings* of *Philosophers*, not to add of *Jews* and *Mahometans*? These things I leave you and the Reader to consider of, and proceed. What follows concerning the *Fathers* and others proving the *Scriptures* to be the *Word of God* by themselves, after they have believed them infallibly on other grounds, is, *gratis dictum*, unless you can prove from the *Fathers*, that they did believe the *Scriptures* infallibly on other grounds. Which when you shall think fit to attempt I make no question to answer, but in the mean time to a crude assertion it is enough to oppose a bare denial. Your following absurdities concerning the *private Spirit*, *Infallible Assurance*, *Apostolical Tradition*, have been frequently examined already. Only what you say, that you read, esteem, nay very highly reverence the *Scripture*; is but *Protestatio contra factum*, as may appear by your former expressions, and therefore can have no force at all with wise Men, who judge by things, and not by bare words.

P. 90.

3. You say, That if there were such sufficient light in *Scripture* to shew it self, you should see it as well as we; seeing you read it as diligently, and esteem it as highly as we do. What! You esteem the *Scripture* as highly as we, who say, that the *Scripture* appears no more of it self to be God's Word, than distinction of colours to a blind Man! You, who but in the Page before had said, there was no more light in *Scripture* to discover it self, than in *Seneca*, *Plutarch*, *Aristotle*, nay, as to some things than the *Talmud* and *Alcoran*! You, who say that, notwithstanding the *Scriptures*, *Christ* would have been esteemed an *Ignoramus* an *Impostor*, if your Church be not *Infallible*! Are you the Man, who esteem as highly of the *Scriptures* as we do? May we not therefore justly return you your own language; and say, that if you do not see this light in *Scripture*, it is because your eyes are perverse, your understanding unsanctified, which instead of discovering such Divine light in *Scripture* as to make you love and adore it, can have the confidence to utter such expressions which tend so highly to the disparagement of it. But did not his Lordship give before a sufficient answer to this objection, by saying, 1. That the light is sufficient in it self, but it doth not follow that it must be evident to every one that looks into it; for the blindness or perverseness of Men's Minds

§. 14.

Ibid. n. 7.

P. 86.

Minds may keep them from the discovery of it. 2. He saith, *This light is not so full a light as that of the first Principles, as, that the whole is greater than the part, that the same thing cannot be, and not be, at the same time.* And yet such is your Sincerity, you would seem at first to persuade the Reader of the contrary in your next Paragraph; but at last you grant that he denies it to be evidently known as one of the Principles of the first sort. (For you with your wonted subtilty distinguish Principles known of themselves, into such as are either evidently, and such as are probably known of themselves, i.e. Principles known of themselves, are either such as are known of themselves, or such as are not; for what is but probably known, is not certainly known of itself, but by that probable argument which causeth assent to it.) But when you deny that the Scripture is so much as one of the second sort of Principles, and say expressly, *That of it self it appears not so much as probably to be more the Word of God, than some other Book that is not truly such;* were you not so used to Contradictions, I would desire you to reconcile this expression, with what you said a little before of your high esteem and Reverence of the Scriptures.

3. The Bishop saith, *That when he speaks of this light in Scripture, he only means it of such a light as is of force to breed Faith, that it is the Word of God; not to make a perfect knowledge.* Now Faith, of whatsoever it is, this, or other Principle, is an evidence, as well as knowledge; and the belief is firmer than any knowledge can be, because it rests upon Divine Authority, which cannot deceive; whereas knowledge (or at least he that thinks he knows) is not ever certain in deductions from Principles; but the Evidence is not so clear. Now God doth not require a full demonstrative knowledge in us that the Scripture is his Word, and therefore in his Providence hath kindled in it no light for that, but he requires our Faith of it, and such a certain demonstration as may fit that. Now what answer do you return to all this? *Why, forsooth, We must have Certainty, nay, an Infallible Certainty, nay such an Infallible Certainty as is built on the Infallible Authority of the Church, yet such an Infallible Authority as can be proved only by Motives of Credibility;* which is a new kind of Climax in Rhetorick, viz. a Ladder standing with both ends upon ground at the same time. All the answer I shall therefore now give it, is, that your Faith then is certain, Infallibly certain, and yet built on but probable Motives, and therefore on your own Principles must be also uncertain, very uncertain, nay undoubtedly and Infallibly uncertain. What again follows concerning Canonical Books and the private Spirit, I must send them, as Constables do Vagrants, to the place from whence they came, and there they shall meet with a sufficient Answer.

S. 15.
P. 91. Gc.
n. 8, 9.

De Ecclef.
l. 3. c. 14.

The remainder of this Chapter consists of a tedious vindication of Bellarmine and Brierly, which being of little consequence to the main business, I shall return the shorter answer. I shall not quarrel much with you about the interpretation of those words of Bellarmine in the sense you give them, viz. if they be understood of absolute necessity, not of all Christians, and only in rare cases, that it is not necessary to believe that there is Scripture, on supposition that the Doctrine of Scripture could be sufficiently conveyed to the minds of any without it, as in the case of the Barbarous Nations mentioned by Irenæus. But for you who make the Tradition of the present Church Infallible, and at the least the Infallible conveyer of the Formal Object of Faith; I do not see how you can avoid making it as absolutely necessary to be believed as any other Object of Faith: Unless your Church hath some other way of conveying Objects of Faith, than by propounding the Scripture infallibly to us. If therefore Men are bound to believe

believe things absolutely necessary to salvation, because contained in that *Book*, which the *Church* delivers to be the *Infallible Word of God*; I cannot possibly see, but the belief of the *Scripture* on the *Churches* Infallible Testimony must be as necessary *necessitate medii* as any thing contained in it. As for the Citation of *Hooker* by *Brierely*, whether it be falsified or no will best be seen by producing the scope and design of that worthy *Author* in the Testimonies cited out of him. Upon an impartial view of which in the several places referred to, I cannot but say, that if *Brierely's* design was to shew that *Hooker* made the authority of the *Church* that into which *Faith* is lastly resolved, he doth evidently contradict *Mr. Hooker's* design, and is therefore guilty of unfaithful representing his meaning. For where he doth most fully and largely express himself he useth these words, which for clearing his meaning must be fully produced. *Scripture* teacheth all supernaturally revealed truth, without the knowledge where-
of salvation cannot be attained. The main principle whereon the belief of all things therein contained dependeth, is, that the *Scriptures* are the Oracles of *God* himself. This in it self we cannot say is evident. For then all Men that hear it would acknowledge it in heart, as they do when they hear that every whole is more than any part of that whole, because this in it self is evident. The other we know that all do not acknowledge it when they hear it. There must be therefore some former knowledge presupposed, which doth herein assure the hearts of all believers. *Scripture* teacheth us that saving truth which *God* hath discovered to the world by Revelation, and it presumeth us taught otherwise, that it self is Divine and Sacred. The question then being by what means we are taught this; some answer, That to learn it we have no other way than only Tradition: As namely that so we believe, because both we from our predecessors, and they from theirs have so received. But is this enough? That which all Men's experience teacheth them, may not in any wise be denied. And by experience we all know, that the first Motive leading Men so to esteem of the *Scripture*, is the Authority of *God's Church*. For when we know the whole *Church* of *God* hath that opinion of the *Scripture*, we judge it even at the first an impudent thing for any Man bred and brought up in the *Church*, to be of a contrary mind without cause. Afterwards the more we bestow our labour in reading or hearing the mysteries thereof, the more we find that the thing it self doth answer our receiv'd opinion concerning it. So that the former inducement prevailing somewhat with us before, doth how much more prevail, when the very thing hath ministred farther reason. Can any thing be more plain (if Men's meaning may be gathered from their words, especially when purposely they treat of a subject) than that *Hooker* makes the Authority of the *Church* the primary inducement to *Faith*, and that rational evidence, which discovers it self in the *Doctrine* revealed to be that which it is finally resolved into? For, as his Lordship saith on this very place of *Hooker*,
The resolution of *Faith* ever settles upon the farthest reason it can, not upon the first inducement. By this place then where this worthy *Author* most clearly and fully delivers his judgment, we ought in reason to interpret all other occasional and incidental passages on the same subject. So in that other place, For whatsoever we believe concerning salvation by *Christ* although the
Scripture be therein the ground of our belief, yet the authority of Man is, if we mark it, the key which openeth the door of entrance into the knowledge of the *Scriptures*. I will not dispute, whether here he speaks concerning the knowledge of *Scripture* to be *Scripture*, or concerning the natural sense and meaning of *Scripture*: suppose I should grant you the latter, it would make little for your purpose; for when he adds, The *Scripture* doth not teach us

L. 3. sect. 8.

P. 90.

L. 2. sect. 7.

the things that are of God, unless we did credit Men who have taught us that the words of Scripture do signifie those things. You need not here bid us stay a while: For his sense is plain and obvious, viz. that Men cannot come to the natural sense and importance of the words used in Scripture, unless they rely on the authority of Men for the signification of those words. He speaks not here then at all concerning Church-Tradition properly taken, but meerly of the authority of Man, which he contends must in many cases be relied on, particularly in that of the sense and meaning of the words which occur in Scripture. Therefore with his Lordships leave and yours too, I do not think that in this place Hooker by the authority of Man doth understand Church-Tradition, but if I may so call it Humane-Tradition, viz. that which acquainteth us with the force and signification of words in use. When therefore you prove, that it is Tradition only, which is all the ground he puts of believing Scripture to be the Word of God, from those words of his, That utterly to infringe the force and strength of Man's testimony, were to shake the very Fortresses of God's truth. Now (say you) How can that Fortresses (the Scriptures) be shaken, were not that authority esteemed by him the ground of that Fortresses? That may very easily be shewn, viz. by calling in question the truth of humane testimony in general; for he plainly speaks of such a kind of humane testimony as that is, whereby we know there is such a City as Rome, that such and such were Popes of Rome, wherein the ground of our perswasion can be nothing else but humane testimony; now take away the credit and validity of this testimony, the very Fortresses of truth must needs be shaken; for we could never be certain that there were such persons, as Moses, the Prophets, Christ and his Apostles in the world, we could never be certain of the meaning of any thing written by them. But how far is this from the final resolution of Faith into Church-Tradition? But the place you lay the greatest force on, is that which you

- L. 2. sect. 4. first cite out of him, Finally we all believe that the Scriptures of God are sacred, and that they have proceeded from God; our selves we assure, that we do right well in so believing. We have for this a demonstration sound and Infallible. But it is not the Word of God which doth or can possibly assure us, that we do well to think it his Word. From hence you infer, that either he must settle no Infallible ground at all, or must say that the Tradition of the Church is that ground. No Infallible ground in your sense, I grant it, but well enough in his own; for all the difficulty lies in understanding what he means by Infallible; which he takes not in your sense for a supernatural, but only for a rational Infallibility; not such a one as excludes possibility of deception, but all reasonable doubting. In which sense he saith of such
- L. 2. sect. 8. things as are capable only of moral certainty, That the Testimony of Man will stand as a ground of Infallible assurance; and presently instanceth in these, That there is such a City of Rome, that Pius V. was Pope there, &c. So afterwards he saith, That the mind of Man desireth evermore to know the truth according to the most Infallible certainty which the nature of things can yield: by which it is plain, that the utmost certainty which things are capable of, is with him Infallible certainty; and so a sound and Infallible ground of Faith is a certain ground, which we all assert may be had without your Churches Infallible Testimony. Whether therefore Brierely and you are not guilty, if not of falsifying Hooker's words, yet of perverting his meaning, let the Impartial Reader judge.

H.

112. 2. 9.

C H A P. VIII.

The Churches Infallibility not proved from Scripture.

Some general considerations from the design of proving the Churches Infallibility from Scripture. No Infallibility in the High Priest and his Clergy under the Law; if there had been, no necessity there should be under the Gospel. Of St. Basil's Testimony concerning Traditions. Scripture less liable to Corruption than Traditions. The great uncertainty of judging Traditions when Apostolical, when not. The Churches perpetuity being promised in Scripture proves not its Infallibility. His Lordship doth not falsifie A. C.'s words, but T. C. doth his meaning. Producing the Jesuits words no traducing their Order. T. C.'s miserable Apology for them. the particular Texts produced for the Churches Infallibility, examined. No such Infallibility necessary in the Apostles Successors as in Themselves. The Similitude of Scripture and Tradition to an Ambassadour and his Credentials, rightly stated.

THE main design of this Chapter being to prove the Infallibility of the Church from the Testimonies of Scripture; before I come to a particular discussion of the matters contained in it, I shall make some general Observations on the scope and design of it, which may give more light to the particulars to be handled in it. 1. That the Infallibility you challenge to the Church, is such as must suppose a promise extant of it in Scripture: Which is evident from the words of A. C. (which you own) to his Lordship, That if he would consider the Tradition of the Church, not only as it is the Tradition of a company of fallible Men, in which sense the Authority of it is humane and fallible, but as the Tradition of a company of Men assisted by Christ and his Holy Spirit; in that sense he might easily find it more than an Introduction, indeed as much as would amount to an Infallible Motive. Whence I infer, that in order to the Churches Testimony being an Infallible Motive to Faith, it must be believed that this Company of Men which make the Church, are assisted by Christ and his Holy Spirit; Now I demand, Supposing there were no Scripture extant (the belief of which you said before in defence of Bellarmine, was not necessary to Salvation) by what means could you prove such an Infallible Assistance of the Holy Spirit in the Catholick Church in order to the perswading an Infidel to believe? Could you to one that neither believes Christ, nor the Holy Ghost, prove evidently that your Church had an assistance of both these? You tell him that he cannot believe that there is a Christ or a Holy Ghost, unless he believes first your Church to be Infallible, and yet he cannot believe your Church to be Infallible, unless he believes there are such things as Christ and the Holy Ghost; for that Infallibility, by your own confession, doth suppose the peculiar assistance of both these. And can any one believe their assistance, before he believes they are? If you say, as you do, By the Motives of Credibility you will prove your Church Infallible (setting aside the absurdity of that which I have fully discovered already.) Is it possible for you to prove your Church Infallible, unless antecedently to the belief of your Churches Infallibility, you can prove to an Infidel the truth of these things?

1. That the names of Christ and the Holy Ghost, are no Chimerical Fancies and Ideas, but that they do import something real: Otherwise an Infidel would speedily tell you, these names imported nothing but some kind of Magical

Spells which could keep Men from error, as long as they carried them about with them. That as well might Mahomet, or any other Impostor, pretend an Infallible Assistance from some Tutelar Angels, with hard Arabick names, as you of Christ, and the Holy Ghost, unless you can make it appear to him, that really there are such Beings as Christ and the Holy Ghost; and when you have proved it to him, and he be upon your proof inclinable to believe it, you are bound to tell him by your Doctrine, that for all these Proofs, he can only fancy there are such Beings, but he cannot really believe them, unless he first believes your Church Infallible. And when he tells you, He cannot, according to your own Doctrine, believe that Infallibility, unless he believes the other first, Would he not cry out upon you, as either lamentable Fools, that did not understand what you said, or egregious Impostors, that play fast and loose with him, bidding him believe first one thing, and then another, till at last he may justly tell you, that in this manner he cannot be persuaded to believe any thing at all? 2. Supposing he should get through this, and believe that there were such Beings as Christ and the Holy Ghost, he may justly ask you, 1. Whether there be nothing else but such a kind of Intellectus Agens, as the Arabick Philosophers imagined, some kind of Being which did assist the understanding in conception? You answer him No, but they are real distinct personalities of the same nature and essence with God himself; then he asks, 2. Whence doth this appear? For these being such grand difficulties, you had need of some very clear evidence of them: If you send him to Scripture, he asks you, To what end? For the belief of that must suppose the truth of the thing in question, that your Church is Infallible in delivery of this Scripture for Divine Revelation. But he further demands, 3. Whence comes that Church which you call Infallible to have this Assistance of both these? Do they assist all kind of Men to make them Infallible? You answer, No. But, Do they assist, though not all Men separately, yet all societies of Men conjunctly? You answer, No. Do they assist all Men only in Religious Actions, of what Religion soever they are? Still you answer, No. Do they assist then all Men of the Christian Religion in their Societies? No. Do they assist all those among the Christians, who say, they have this Assistance? No. Do they thus assist all Churches to keep them from error? No. Whom is it then that they do thus infallibly assist? You answer, The Church. But what Church do you mean? The Catholick Church. But, which is this Catholick Church (for, I hear, there are as great Controversies about that, as any thing.) You must answer confidently, That Church which is in the Roman Communion, is the true Catholick Church. Have then all in that Communion this Infallible Assistance? No. Have all the Bishops in this Communion it? No. Have all these Bishops this Assistance, when met together? Yes, say you, undoubtedly, if the Pope be their Head, and confirm their Acts. Then it should seem to me, that this Infallible Assistance is in the Pope, and he it is whom you call the Catholick Church: But surely he is a very big Man then, is he not? But, say you, These are Controversies which are not necessary for you to know, it sufficeth that the Catholick Church is the subject of Infallibility. But, I had thought nothing could have been more necessary than to have known this: But I proceed then, How comes this Catholick Church to have this Infallible Assistance? Cannot I suppose that Christ and the Holy Spirit may exist without giving this Assistance? Cannot I suppose that Christian Religion may be in the World, without such an Infallibility? Is this Assistance therefore a necessary, or a free Act? A free Act. If a free Act, then, for all you know, Your Catholick Church may not be so assisted: No, (you reply) you are sure it is so assisted. But, Whence can you be sure of

an arbitrary thing, unless the Authors of this Assistance have engaged themselves by Promise, to give your Catholick Church that Infallible Assistance? Yes, that they have (you reply) and then produce, *Luke 10. 16. Mat. 28. 20. John 14. 16.* But, although our Infidel might ask some untoward Questions still; as, How you are sure these are Divine Promises, when the knowledge that they are Divine must suppose the thing to be true, which you would prove out of them, viz. that your Church is Infallible? Supposing them Divine, how are you sure, That, and no other, is the meaning of them, when from such places you prove, that your Church is the only Infallible Interpreter of Scripture? But, I let pass these, and other Questions, and satisfy myself with this, That it is impossible for you to prove such an Infallible Assistance of Christ and the Holy Spirit, unless you produce some express Promise for it.

2. This being impossible, it necessarily follows, That the only Motives of Credibility, which can prove your Church Infallible, must be such as do antecedently prove these Promises to be Divine. This is so plain and evident a Consequence from the former, that it were an affront upon humane understanding, to go about to prove it: For, if the Infallibility doth depend upon the Promise, nothing can prove that Infallibility, but what doth prove that Promise to be True and Divine: True, or else not to be believed; Divine, or else not to be relied on for such an Assistance; none else being able to make a promise of it, but the Author of it. As therefore my right to an Estate as given by Will, depends wholly upon the Truth and Validity of that Will, which I must first prove, before I can challenge any right to it; So your pretence of Infallibility must solely depend upon the Promises which you challenge it by. By which it appears, that your attempting to prove the Infallibility of your Church, by Motives of Credibility, antecedent to, and independent on the Scripture, is vain, ridiculous, and destructive to that very Infallibility which you pretend to. Which, being by a free Assistance of Christ and his Spirit, must wholly depend on the proof of the Promise made of it. For, if you prove no Promise, all your Motives of Credibility prove nothing at all, as I have at large demonstrated before, and shall not follow you in needless repetitions.

3. No right to any privilege can be challenged, by virtue of a free Promise made to particular persons, unless it be evident that the intention of the Promiser was, that it should equally extend to them and others. For the Promise being free, and the Privilege such as carries no necessity at all along with it, in order to the great ends of Christian Religion; it is intolerable Arrogance and Presumption to challenge it, without manifest evidence, that the design of it was for them, as well as the Persons to whom it was made. Indeed, in such Promises which are built on common and general grounds, containing things agreeable to all Christians, it is but reasonable to infer the universal extent of that Promise to all such as are in the like condition. Hence the Apostle infers, from the particular Promise made to Joshua, *I will never leave thee, nor forsake thee*; the effect of it upon all believers. Although, had not the Apostle done it before us, it may seem questionable on what ground we could have done it, unless from the general reason of it, and the unbounded nature of Divine Goodness, in things necessary for the Good of his People. But in things arbitrary, and such as contain special Privilege in them, to challenge a right to a Promise of the same Privilege, without equal evidence of the descent of it, as the first Grant, is great presumption, and a challenge of the Promisor for Partiality, if he doth not make it good. Because the pretence of the right of the Privilege goes upon this ground, that it is as much due to the Successor, as to the Original Grantee.

4. No-

4. Nothing can be more unreasonable, than to challenge a right to a Privilege, by virtue of such a Promise which was granted upon quite different considerations from the grounds on which that right is challenged. Thus I shall after make it evident, that the Promise of an *Infallible Assistance* of the Holy Ghost, had a peculiar respect to the Apostles present employment, and the first state of the Church, that it was not made upon reasons common to all Ages, viz. for the Government of the Church, deciding Controversies, Foundation of Faith, all which Ends may be sufficiently attained without them. But, above all, it seems very unreasonable, that a Promise made to Persons in one office, must be applied in the same manner to Persons in a quite different office; that a Promise made to each of them separate, must be equally applied to others only as in Council; that a Promise made implying Divine Assistance, must be equally applied to such, who dare not say, that Assistance is Divine (but Infallible, and after a sort Divine) that a Promise made of immediate Divine Revelation, and enabling the Persons who enjoyed the Privilege of it, to work Miracles to attest their Testimony to be Infallible, should be equally applied to such as dare not challenge a Divine Revelation, nor ever did work a Miracle to attest such an Infallible Assistance. Yet all this is done by you in your endeavour of fetching the Infallibility of your Church, out of those Promises of the assistance of Christ and his Spirit, which were made to the Apostles. These general Considerations, do sufficiently enervate the force of your whole Chapter, which yet I come particularly to consider.

S. 2.
Sect. 16.
n. 26.

His Lordship tells A. C. That in the second sense of Church-Tradition, he cannot find that the Tradition of the present Church is of Divine and Infallible Authority, till A. C. can prove that this company of Men (the Roman Prelates and Clergy he means) are so fully, so clearly, so permanently assisted by Christ, and his Spirit, as may reach to Infallibility, much less to a Divine Infallibility, in this or any other Principle which they teach. In answer to this, you tell us, That the Bishop declines the Question by withdrawing his Reader from the thesis, to the hypothesis; from the Church, to the Church of Rome. But, Is it not sufficiently known to all Persons who deal in this Controversie, what you mean by the Catholick Church in this Controversie, that it shall not be lawful for his Lordship in a Parenthesis, to shew where you place this Infallibility, but he must be charged with declining the Question? This only shews a desire to cavil at little things, when you were unable to answer greater. Besides, in the way you take of proving the Churches Infallibility by the Motives of Credibility, there is a necessity even in this Controversie, of declaring what that Catholick Church is, which must be known by these Motives; and therefore you have no cause to look upon this as running away from the Question. That A. C. after a long and silent attention, did merely, through the heat of his zeal, become earnest in this business, to do his adversary good. I must believe it, because you tell me so, though I see no great Motive of Credibility for it. And on that account did desire him, to consider the Tradition of the Church, as of a company of Men infallibly assisted. For such assistance (you say) is necessary as well to have sufficient assurance of the true Canon of Holy Scripture, as to come to the true meaning and interpretation thereof. But this is as easily denied as said. We wait therefore for your Proofs.

P. 91. n. 26.

That which only seems here intended for that end, is, That when the Relator had said, The Prophets under the Old Testament, and the Apostles under the New, had such an Infallible Divine Assistance; but neither the High Priest with his Clergy in the Old, nor any Company of Prelates or Priests in the New, since the

the Apostles, ever had it. To this you reply, That the like assistance (with P. 97. n. 14. the Prophets and Apostles) the High Priest with his Clergy had in the Old Testament, as we gather out of Deut. 17. 8. &c. Where in doubts the people were bound, not only to have recourse to the High Priest and his Clergy, but to submit and stand to their judgment. Much more then ought we to think, that there is such an obligation in the New Testament; which could not stand without Infallibility. Witness the infinite dissentions and divisions in Points of Faith, amongst all the different Christians that deny it.

Two things the force of this argument lies in. 1. That there was Infallibility in the High Priest and his Clergy under the Law. 2. That if there were so then, there ought to be so now. Both these must be considered.

1. That there was Infallibility in the High Priest and his Clergy under the Law, which you prove from Deut. 17. 8. Because there the people were not only to have recourse to them, but to submit and stand to their judgment. This argument in form, is this. Where there is to be not only a recourse, but an obligation to submission, there must be Infallibility; but there were both these among the Jews, as to the High Priest and his Clergy; ergo. You may see how forcible this argument is in a like case: Where there is to be not only a recourse in matters of difficulty, but an obligation to submit and stand to their judgment, there must be Infallibility; but to the Parliament of England there ought to be not only a recourse in matters of difficulty, but a submission to their judgment; therefore the Parliament of England is as infallible as the High Priest and Clergy under the Law, by the very argument by you produced. The same will hold for all Courts of Justice. But, Can you by no means distinguish between an obligation to submission, and an obligation in conscience to assent to what is determined as infallibly true? Is every person in all judiciary Cases, where submission is required, bound to believe the Judges sentence infallible? If so, we need not go over the Alps for Infallibility, we may have it much cheaper at home: But, I suppose you will reply, The case is very different, because in the Text by you produced, 1. Not Civil Matters, but Religious are spoken of. 2. That not any Civil Magistrates, but the High Priest and his Clergy are the Judges mentioned. 3. That not every kind of Judgment, but an Infallible Judgment is there set down. But, if every one of these be false, you will see, what little advantage comes to your cause by this Testimony; which I shall in order demonstrate.

1. That this place speaks not of Religious Causes, as such; but of Civil Causes, i. e. not of matters of Doctrine to be decided as true or false, but matters of Justice to be determined as to right and wrong. Not but that some things concerning the Ecclesiastical Polity of the Nation might be there decided; for it was impossible in a Nation, whose Laws depended on their Religion, to separate the one from the other: But, that the Judgment given there, did not determine the truth and fallhood of things, so as to oblige Men's Consciences to believe them; but did so peremptorily decide them, that the persons concerned were bound to acquiesce in that determination. For the proof of this, one would think, the very reading of the place were sufficient. If there arise a matter too hard for thee in Judgment, between blood and blood, between plea and plea, and between stroke and stroke, being matters of Deut. 17. 8. controversie within thy gates, then shalt thou arise and get thee up into the place which the Lord thy God shall chuse, &c. Which words are so generally expressed, on purpose to take in all manner of controversies which might rise among them, whether civil, criminal, or ceremonial. And herein God makes provision against any rupture which might be among them upon any emergent Controversie, by establishing a Court of Appeals, to which all such

such causes should be brought, in which the lesser Courts could not agree. For that seems to be the main scope of the words, by the following expression of *Controversies within thy gates*, by which it seems evident, that the *Controversies* were such as could come to no resolution in those inferior Courts which sat in the *Gates of the Cities*; by which it appears, that these could be no momentous *Controversies of Religion*, which never came under the cognizance of those inferior and subordinate Courts. By these words then God doth erect a Supreme Court of Judicature among them, to which they might appeal, not only in case of injury, but in case of difficulty; and those lesser Courts, as well as particular persons, were to submit to the Decree of the great Sanhedrin, sitting in the place which God should chuse, which was *Shilo* first, and *Hierusalem* after. And thence *Maimonides* so often saith, That the establishment and coagmentation of all the *Israelites*, did depend upon this place; for hereby God set up such a Tribunal, to which the last Resort should be made, and from whose determinations there should remain no further appeal. And according to the Tradition of the *Jews*, these appeals were to be gradual, i. e. in case any Priest should be to seek as to any Ceremonial Cause, as that of *Leprosse*, brought before him, he was to take advice of the Court of the *Triumvirate* where he lived; if that did not agree, then he was to appeal to the lesser Sanhedrin of 23. in the neighbour-City; if there it could not be ended, to the Sanhedrin of 23. at the entrance of the Mount of the Temple; if not there neither, then appeal was made to the Great Sanhedrin, whose sentence was final and peremptory, and was instead of a Law in the Case.

2. You are greatly mistaken in supposing that all this is spoken of the High Priest and his Clergy: I deny not but express mention is made of the Priests and Levites, as those who were supposed most acquainted with all matters of difference which should happen among them; and therefore were probably the greatest part of the great Sanhedrin (for it is a groundless fancy to suppose two distinct Courts, the one Civil, and the other Ecclesiastical among the *Jews*.) Nay the High Priest himself was so far from being the constant President of this Court, that, if we believe the Tradition of the *Jews*, he was not admitted to sit there, without the same previous examination and tryal which others underwent. Indeed, in the decay of the *Jewish* Polity, in the time of the *Assomanean* Family, the chief Civil Power was in the hands of the High Priest, on which account he might then preside in the Sanhedrin, but that is nothing to this place, where mention is made verse 9. of the Priests and Levites, and then of the Judge, which is, in case God should raise up among them an extraordinary person, who should be Judge over *Israel*, then the appeals might be to him; but otherwise verse 10. they were to do according to the sentence, which they of that place which the Lord shall chuse, shall shew thee, which was the great Sanhedrin. According therefore to the sentence of this Court, whether pronounced by a Priest, or other, they were to act; and they that refused were punished with death.

3. Whoever the persons were, who gave this Sentence, yet it was not looked on as Infallible; for it is not said, *Whosoever doth not believe the judgment given, to be infallibly true*; but, *whosoever acts contumaciously in opposition to it. And the Man that will do presumptuously, and will not hearken unto the Priest, or unto the Judge, even that Man shall dye*. Besides, we are so far from reading of any promise of Infallibility made to the High Priest and his Clergy, or to the Sanhedrin, that God himself doth suppose a possibility of error in the whole Congregation of *Israel*, *Levit. 4. 15*. And all along the Books of the Prophets, we see how much God chargeth the Priests with Ignorance, and

Deut. 17.
12.

and forsaking his way. And, I pray, Where was that *Infallibility* of the High Priest and his Clergy, not only when our blessed Saviour was condemned by him, and the Sanhedrin both; but in that time, when Israel for a long ^{2 Chron. 15. 3.} season had been without the True God, and without a Teaching Priest, and without Law? So that we see what very little relief you have out of this place for the *Infallibility* of the High Priest and his Clergy. But, suppose we should grant them *Infallible*, and that *Infallibility* proved from this place, What is that to us? Might not you as well challenge the *Oracula Responsæ* by *Urim* and *Thummim* to belong to you, as the High Priest's *Infallibility*, supposing he had any? If God thought it fit to make them *Infallible*, and gave such express command concerning obedience and submission to their judgment, Is it not very reasonable to think, that under the Gospel there should be express mention made of the subject of this *Infallibility*, the place whither we should resort for final judgments, as there is here? Nay, had it not been far more necessary to have specified and determined these circumstances, since they are of such vast importance for the peace of the Christian world? How easily had all our debates been ended, if God had said any where in the New Testament, *When any Controversie of Faith ariseth, go to the place which I shall chuse, viz. Rome, and there enquire the judgment of the Bishop that shall sit there, and whatever he determines, that believe as infallibly true*: if we had met with any thing so express, nay, that had any seeming tendency this way, How readily should we submit our Controversies to his determination; But, when there is so little ground or foundation for it there, that you are fain to deduce your *Infallibility*, from God's settling a Court of Appeals among the Jews; Can you think that we are presumptuous, and deserve to be cut off, if we do not believe? For, for all that I know, you may challenge the sanction of the Law, as well as the Privilege of it, and your former practices would persuade us, that you believe the Sanction to be as valid as the other.

But (say you) the infinite dissentions and divisions among those that deny it, make this necessary. 1. I pray, Doth your pretence of *Infallibility* put an end to all your divisions? Nay, Are there not many among your selves, raised meerly on the account of this *Infallibility*? Have not many among you, grown so weary of it, that they have wished the name had never been mentioned? Are not others so ashamed of the thred-bare impertinent places of Scripture, commonly produced, that they have ventured the censure of your Church for disowning them, and have sheltered themselves under the *Infallibility* of Universal Tradition? Have not some ingenuously confessed, that there is no avoiding the circle on the common grounds? Are those no differences at all concerning the subject of *Infallibility*, and the Superiority of Pope and Council? Happy Men! that have so many coincident distinctions, and such agreeing differences! 2. Were there not dissentions and divisions in the Apostles times? And, had it not been, think you, much better for the Apostle, instead of saying, *There must be heresies or divisions among you, that they which are approved, may be made manifest*, to have told them, *There must be an Infallible Judge among you, that there may be no heresies or divisions*? If you had been at his Elbow, what prudent advice you would have given S. Paul for ending all the divisions in the Corinthian, Colossian, Galatian Churches, &c.! You must have told him, that it was to very little purpose to wooe them by the many arguments he useth to exhort them so often to unity, and chide them as carnal, while they had dissentions, when one word of an *Infallible Judge* had ended all of them. But, poor S. Paul knew of no such thing, which made him give as good

H h

counsels;

counsels, as the Spirit of God directed him to; but alas, they were but sorry things in comparison of an *Infallible Judge*: Give us leave therefore to reckon our selves among those *Primitive Christians*, who knew no more than we of any such way to end differences, as *Infallibility* in a constant Judge, for all they had dissentions and divisions among them as well as we.

But you are very angry with his Lordship for taxing this pretence of *Infallibility* with *Insolency*, and a design to Lord it over the Faith of *Christianity*. And therefore tell him, You go no further than Christ himself leads you by Promises made of this *Infallibility*; That is the thing in question, and must not be taken upon the trust of your *Infallibility*, in interpreting the places by you alledged. When you can prove the Pastors of your Church, to be as *Infallible* as the Apostles were, and to have the same Spirit which they had, I shall as little suspect them of *Lording it over others as the Apostles*: but if it appear quite otherwise as to the Pastors of your Church; name, if you can, a greater *Insolency*, than to usurp a power of prescribing to the Faith of the *Christian world*. As to what follows concerning your Churches Testimony, being again *Infallible* by the assistance of Christ and his Spirit, and yet not *Divinely Infallible*, it is so subtle and Scholastical a distinction, that I now begin, not to admire your so often using it; for I see plainly, if that wedge, how blunt soever, doth not rive asunder the knot, it is like to remain for any thing you have to say to it.

His Lordship having given one Instance of the *Insolency* of your pretence of *Infallibility*, by the dangerous errors which your Church doth hold, particularly in equalling the Tradition of the present Church to the written Word of God, which (saith he) is a Doctrine unknown to the Primitive Church, and which frets upon the very Foundation it self, by justling with it. But, being well acquainted with the Arts of your party in making a great noise with the Fathers, and particularly in this Controversie, with a citation out of S. Basil's Books de Spirit. Sanct. ad Amphilochem, and especially those words, *parem vim habent ad pietatem*, speaking of Traditions; he therefore in his Margent so far takes notice of them, as to return this threefold Answer to them.

1. That he speaks of Apostolical Tradition, and not the Tradition of the present Church. 2. That exceptions are taken at this Book as corrupted. 3. That S. Basil makes Scripture the Touchstone of Tradition. To this you return a threefold Answer. 1. That 'tis true, he speaks of Apostolical Traditions, but of such as were come down to their present times. 2. That the exceptions against the Book are unreasonable. 3. That S. Basil doth not make the Scripture so to be the touchstone of Tradition, as that Scripture must needs therefore be of greater force and superiour dignity than that of Tradition. Because therefore this is the chief place in Antiquity which is produced on your side in behalf of Traditions, it will deserve a more careful examination in the particulars by you mentioned.

1. You acknowledge that he speaks of Apostolical Traditions and such as the present Church judged Apostolical; now you say that the present Church is infallible in judging Apostolical Traditions, and what Traditions are so judged are necessary to be practised. Now I pray consider what difficulties and self-contradictions you have brought your self into, by acknowledging these Traditions to have been judged Apostolical by the present Church. For either that Church at that time was not *Infallible* in judging Traditions, and so the present Church of every age is not *Infallible*; or if that was infallible, yours is not; for your Church differs from the Church in S. Basil's time about these very Traditions by him mentioned, your Church not judging them Apostolical. Which will appear by an inspection

into

into those things which are here accounted *Traditions* by him. Among which he not only mentions *signing believers with the sign of the Cross, praying toward the East, the oyl and the abrenunciation used in Baptism*, but the consecration of the Person to be Baptized, the standing at Prayers until Pentecost, and above all, the *trine immersion in Baptism*, all which he saith come *ἐκ τῆ ἀδικομενότητος τούτου, καὶ ἀπορρίπτει διδασκαλίας, ἣν ἐν ὑπομνήματι καὶ ἀπρὸς ἡμᾶς οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν πατέρι ἡμῶν ἐφύλαξεν*, Out of a secret and unpublished Tradition, which our Fathers preserved in a quiet and silent manner. Are these three last then acknowledged by your Church now for Apostolical Traditions or no? Nay, doth not your Roman Catechism absolutely pronounce the *trine immersion* to be unnecessary for Baptism? How can that become unnecessary, which was once *Infallibly* judged to be an Apostolical Tradition? Either the Church then was out in her judgment, or your Church out in hers; and choose whether of those you have the more mind to? Either of them will help you to contradict your self.

S. Basil de
Sp. S. c.
27. Tom. I.

Catechismi.
Rom. de
baptis.

2. There want not sufficient reasons of suspecting that Book to be corrupted. You say *Erasmus* was the first who suspected it. Not the first who suspected corruption in St. Basil's writings. For *Marcus Ephesius* in the Florentine Council charged some Latinizing Greeks with corrupting his Books against *Eunomius*, protesting that in Constantinople there were but four Copies to above one thousand which had the passages in them, which were produced by the *Latins*. But suppose *Erasmus* were the first: was he not so in discovering the genuine and supposititious writings of several others of the Fathers? We must therefore enquire into the reason which *Erasmus* had of this suspicion; Who tells us in his Epistle to *John Dantiscus* the Poland Ambassador, that by that time he had gone through half this work he discerned a palpable inequality in the style, sometimes swelling to a Tragical height, and then sinking into a vulgar flatness, having much more of ostentation, impertinent digression, repetitions, than any of St. Basil's own writings, which had always a great deal of vigour, simplicity and candour, with great evenness and equality, &c. And although this argument to all that know the worth of that excellent Person, especially in his judgment of the writings of the Fathers, will seem by no means contemptible, yet we have much greater reason for our suspicion than this meely from the style. For if you believe St. Basil was a Man who knew how to speak consistencies, that he would not utter palpable and evident contradictions in his writings; you will have no reason to applaud your self in this as a genuine piece of St. Basil's, at least for the latter part of it. For whereas you make this the force of his words, That *unwritten Traditions have equal force to stir up Piety, with the written Word*: You could hardly have numed so many words which bear a greater face of contradiction to a multitude of testimonies in his unquestionable genuine writings. For, is it not St. Basil who saith, That it is a manifest falling from the Faith, and an argument of arrogancy, either to reject any point of those things that are written, or to bring in any of those things that are not written? Is it not St. Basil who bids a Man Believe the things that are written, and seek not the things that are written? Is it not the same St. Basil, who saith, That every word and action ought to be confirmed by the Testimony of Holy Scripture for confirmation of the Faith of the good, and

φανερὰ ἐκ τῶν πρὸς πῖστεν, καὶ ἐκ τῶν παλαιῶν γραμμάτων, ἢ ἀδικομενότητος τούτου. Basil. de verâ ac piâ fide. Tom. 2. op. gr. lat. p. 386.

Τοῖς γεγραμμένοις πιστεῖτε, τὰ μὴ γεγραμμένα μὴ ζητεῖτε. Hom. 29. de Trinit. Tom. I.

Ὅτι δὲ τῶν ῥήμα, ἢ πρᾶγμα πιστεῖται τῇ μαρτυρίᾳ τῆς διορνέουσας γραφῆς, οὐκ ἐκ τῆς πλεονεξίας μὲν τῶν ἀγαθῶν, οὐκ ἐκ τῆς τῶν πονηρῶν. In Ethicis. Reg. 16. v. Tom. 2.

Πάν το ἐκ τῆς διορνέουσας γραφῆς ἐκ τῆς πίστεως ἐν, ἀμαρτία ἐστίν. Ib. reg. 80. c. 22.

confusion of the evil : Is it not he who utteth that very place to this purpose, *Whatsoever is not of Faith is Sin* ; then whatsoever is without the Holy Scripture, being not of Faith, is Sin. Which at least must be understood of such things which Men have an opinion of piety and necessity in the doing of. These and many other places may be produced out of his genuine writings attesting the clean contrary to what you produce this place for. What then must we think of him ? Must we say of him as he did of Gregory Thaumaturgus, that he spoke some things not *δρυσμασ*, but *ἀγνοήσας*, not as though he believed them ; but for *disputation* sake, because they served his purpose well ? Or rather, have we not much greater reason considering the contrariety of the *Doctrine*, as well as inequality of *style*, to follow Erasmus his judgment concerning this Book ? Especially considering that Belarmine himself, who slights Erasmus his judgment herein ; yet when he is pinched with a citation out of his *Asceticks*, calls the sincerity of that Book into question, because he doth not therein seem to admit of *unwritten Traditions*, which (saith he) *ad Amphilochem* he doth strenuously defend. If therefore he may question another Book for not agreeing with *this*, we may more justly question this for disagreeing with so many others. Thus you see, it is not merely the *style*, and that only on the judgment of Erasmus, which makes this Book suspicious. And from those citations produced out of other writings of St. Basil, the (3.) thing evidently appears, *viz.* That he so makes the Scripture the Touchstone of all Traditions, as that Scripture must be incomparably of greater force and superiour dignity, than any unwritten Tradition whatsoever. But Whether Stapleton in his testimony meant primarily Apostolical Traditions, or others, is not worth the enquiring.

Concerning what follows, as to the sincerity and agreement of ancient Copies of Scripture, and the means to be assured of the integrity of them, I have sufficiently expressed my self already. Only what you add concerning the Integrity of Traditions above the Scripture, being new, deserves to be considered. For, (say you) universal Traditions are recorded in Authors of every succeeding Age : And it seems much more incident to have errors slip into writings of so great bulk as is the Bible, which in their Editions pass only through the hands of particular Men, than that there should be errors in publick, universal, and immemorial Traditions, which are openly practised throughout Christendome, and taken notice of by every one in all Ages. And from hence you instance in S. John's Epistle, or St. Luke's Gospel, which being originally written to particular Persons, must be at first received as authentical upon their credit : But, on the other side, Apostolical Traditions (for which you instance in the Observation of the Lord's-day, Infant Baptism, use of Altars, &c.) in their prime institution and practice being publickly practised and owned by the Apostles ; it was incomparably harder, morally speaking, to doubt in the beginning of these Traditions, than whether St. John's Epistle, or St. Luke's Gospel were really theirs or no. Whence we see some Books that were written by Apostles were questioned for some time, but these and such like Traditions, were always owned, as truly and really descending from the Apostles. To which I answer, 1. If you prove not some Tradition thus universally owned and received which we have no record of, or ground for the observation of from Scripture, you speak nothing at all to the purpose ; but two of those you instance in, Observation of the Lord's Day, and Pedobaptism, we have as much as is requisite for the Churches practice from Scripture itself ; for the other, Of the use of Altars, it were a work becoming you to deduce the History of them from the Apostolical times, beginning at the upper room where the Apostles met after Christ's Ascension, and

Basil. ep.
64.

L. 4. de
v. D. c. 7.
De Amiff.
Grat. l. 1.
c. 13.

S. 4.1

Ibid. n. 2.

so

so tracing them through all the private *Houses* and *Synagogues* in which the *Christians* in the *Apostles times* had their solemn Assemblies for Divine Worship; thence bringing down the History of them carefully through all the *Persecutions*, and producing evidences to that purpose, out of *Tertullian*, *Origen*, *Miltadius Felix*, and *Arnobius*, only blotting out *non* where they speak of *Altars* and *Temples* among *Christians*, and telling us that some *Protestants* had corrupted their Books; that where they utterly disown them, they did highly magnifie them, that where they seemed to speak most against them, it was not to let the *Heathens* know that they had them: By this means indeed you are like to acquaint us with some *Universal Tradition* less liable to corruption and alteration than the *Scriptures*. For this of *Altars* is the only thing by you mentioned, which seems any thing to your purpose, the other two being sufficiently proved from *Scripture*; which acquaints us so much with *Apostolical practice*, as to yield abundant reason for the practice of following *Ages*. You do well therefore to wrap up all other such *Traditions* as might vie with the *Scriptures* for integrity, in a *prudent*, &c. For you cannot but know that this game of *Tradition* is quite spoiled, if we offer to come to particulars. But it is a fine thing in general to talk of the *impossibility* of corrupting such a *Tradition* as had its rise from the practice of the *Apostles*, and was by them delivered to succeeding ages, and so was universally practised by all *Christians* as derived from the *Apostles*; but when we put but that sullen demand, that such a thing as hath no evidence in *Scripture* may be named which was so universally received and owned as the *Scriptures* are, how many put off's, and *&c.'s*. do we meet withal for fear of being evidently disproved in the particular instanced in? 2. If there be so much greater evidence for *Tradition* than *Scripture*, whence came the very next *Ages* to the *Apostles* to be so doubtful as to *Traditions*, which yet were agreed in receiving the *Scripture*? I speak not of such things, which we have not the least evidence the *Apostles* ever thought of, much less universally practised (such as we contend the things in controverſie between you and us are) but in such things which undoubtedly the *Apostles* did practise, so as that the *Christians* of that *Age* could not but know such a practice of theirs. As in that Controverſie which soon rise in the *Church*, about the day of the *Observation* of *Easter*; what contests soon grew between the *Asian* and *Roman Christians* about this, both equally pretending *Apostolical Tradition*, and that at the least distance imaginable from the *Apostolical times*? For *Polyoarp* professed to receive his *Tradition* from *St. John*, as those at *Rome* from *St. Peter*. If then *Traditions* be so uncapable of falsification and corruption, how came they to be so much to seek, as to what the *Apostolical Tradition* was in the very next *Age* succeeding the *Apostles*? What, Could not those who lived in *St. John's* and *St. Peter's* time know what they did? Could they be deceived themselves, or had they an intent to deceive their *Posterity*? If some of them did falsifie *Tradition* so soon, we see what little certainty there is in the deriving a *Tradition* from the *Apostles*: If neither falsified, then it should seem there was no universal practice of the *Apostles* concerning it, but they looked on it as a matter of *indifferency*, and some might practise one way, and some another. If so, then we are yet further to seek for an *Universal Tradition* of the *Apostles*, binding succeeding *Ages*. For can you possibly think the *Apostles* did intend to bind unalterably succeeding *Ages* in such things which they used a *Liberty* in themselves? If then it be granted, that in matters of an *indifferent nature* the *Apostles* might practise severally as they saw occasion, How then can we be certain of the *Apostles universal practice* in

in matters of an *indifferent nature*? If we cannot so, we can have no evidence of an *Universal Tradition* of the *Apostles*, but in some things which they judged necessary. But whence shall we have this unquestionable evidence, *first*, that they did such *things*, and *secondly*, that they did them with an apprehension of the *necessity* of them, and with an intention to oblige posterity by their actions? By what rule or measure must we judge of this necessity? By their *universal practice*? But that brings us into a plain *Circle*; for we must judge of the *necessity* of it by their *universal practice*, and we must prove that *universal practice* by the *necessity* of the thing. For, if the thing were not judged necessary, the *Apostles* might differ in their *practice* from one another. Whence then shall we prove any *practice* necessary, unless built on some *unalterable* ground of reason, and then it is not *formally* an *Apostolical Tradition*, but the *use* of that common reason and prudence in matters of a religious nature: Or else by some positive *Law* and *Institution* of theirs; and this, supposing it unwritten, must be evidenced from something distinct from their practice, or else you must assert, that whatever the *Apostles* did, they made an *unalterable Law* for; or lastly, you must quit all *Unwritten Traditions* as *Universal*, and must first infer the *necessity*, and then the *Universality* of their practice from some *record* extant in *Scripture*, and then you can be no further certain of any *Universal practice* of the *Apostles*, than you are of the *Scriptures*: By which it will certainly appear that the *Scripture* is far more evident and credible, than any *universal unwritten Tradition*.

A clear and evident Instance of the uncertainty of knowing Apostolical Traditions in things not defined in Scripture, is one of those you instance in your self, *viz.* that of *Rebaptizing Hereticks*, which came to be so great a *Controversie*, so soon after the *Apostolical Age*. For though this *Controversie* rose to its height in St. *Cyprian's* time, which was about A. D. 250. yet it was begun some competent time before that. For St. *Cyprian*, in his Epistle to *Jubaianus*, where he gives an account of the General Council of the Provinces of *Africa and Numidia*, consisting of seventy one *Bishops*, endeavours to remove all suspicion of Novelty from their opinion, For (saith he) *it is no new or sudden thing among us to judge that those ought to be baptized, who come to the Church from He-*

Apud nos autem, non nova aut repentina res est, ut baptizandos censeamus eos qui ab haereticis ad Ecclesiam veniunt; quando multi jam anni sunt, & longa aetas, ex quo sub Agrippino convenientes in unum Episcopi plurimi hoc statuerint, atque exinde in hodiernum diem tot millia haereticorum, &c. Cyprian ep. 73.

De baptis-
m. c. Do-
nat. l. 4.

have been but a few years; yet we have greater evidence both of the greater antiquity, and larger spread of this Opinion. Whereby we may see, how little the judgment of *Vincentius Lirinensis* is to be relied on as to

Agrippinus omnium mortalium primus contra Divinum Canonem, contra universalis Ecclesiae regulam, contra sensum omnium confacerdotum, contra morem atque instituta majorum, baptizandos eos qui ab haereticis ad Ecclesiam venirent, censuisse. Commonit. l. 1. cap. 9.

reticks; for now many years are past, and a long time, since, under Agrippinus, the Bishops meeting together did determine it in Council, and thousands of Hereticks have voluntarily submitted to it. How far off could that be from the *Apostolical* times, which was done so long before *Cyprian's*? And, although St. *Augustine* (as it was his interest so to do) would make this to

Traditions, who gives *Agrippinus* such hard words, for being the first who against Scripture, the Rule of the Universal Church, the judgment of all his Fellow-Priests, the Custom of his Ancestors, did assert the Rebaptization of Hereticks. How little Truth there is in what *Vincentius* here says, and consequently, how little certainty in his way of finding out Traditions, will appear from the words of *Dionysius* of Alexandria, in his Epistle to *Philemon* and *Dionysius* concerning this subject. For therein he asserts,

That

That long before that custom obtained in Africa, the same was practised and decreed in the most famous Churches both at Iconium, Synada, and other places. On which account this great person professeth, that he durst not condemn their Opinion who held so. Whether this Synod at Iconium were the same with that mentioned by Firmilian, is not so certain, but, if it were, that can be no argument against the Antiquity of it. For, *That we long ago, meeting in Iconium, from Galatia, Cilicia, and the neighbour Regions have confirmed the same, viz. that Hereticks should be baptized;* yet, as the learned *Valesius* observes, the pronoun *We*, is not to be understood of Firmilian's person, but of his predecessors; and therefore checks both *Baronius* and *Binius* for placing that Synod, A. D. 258. We see therefore this Opinion was so largely spread, that not only the Churches in Africa, Numidia, and Mauritania favoured it, but almost all the Eastern Christians. For *Dionysius* in an Epistle to *Xystus*, who succeeded *Stephanus* at Rome, wherein he pleads for Moderation as to this Controversie, and desires him more thoroughly to consider the weight of the business, and not proceed so rashly as *Stephanus* had done; he tells him in conclusion, that he writ not this of himself, but at the request of the several Bishops of Antioch, Casarea, Helia, Tyre, Laodicea, Tarsus, &c. Nay, and as it appears by Firmilian's Epistle, they made no question but this custom of theirs descended from Christ and his Apostles: For telling *Cyprian*, that in such places where the other custom had been used, they did well to oppose truth to custom; But we (saith he) joyn truth and custom together, and to the custom of the Romans, we oppose the custom of truth, holding that from the beginning, which was delivered by Christ and his Apostles. But therefore adds, Neither do we remember when this practice began, seeing it was always observed among us. And thence charges the Church of Rome, in that Epistle, with violating that, and several other Traditions of the Apostles. And *Vincentius Lirinensis* still takes *Stephens* part; and all that he hath to say, is, That that is the property of Christian modesty and gravity, not to deliver their own Opinions to their posterity, but to retain the Tradition of their Fore-fathers. As tho' the other side could not say the same things, and with as much confidence as they did: but all the Question was, What that Tradition was which they were to retain? The one said one thing, and the other another. But, as *Rigaltius* well observes, *Vincentius* speaks very truly and prudently, if nothing were delivered, by our Ancestors, but what they had from the Apostles; but, under the pretence of our Ancestors, silly or counterfeit things may by fools or knaves be delivered us for Apostolical Traditions. And whether this doth not often come to pass, let the world judge. Now therefore, when these persons on both sides had incomparably greater advantages of knowing what the Universal Apostolical practice was than we can have, and yet so irreconcilably differ about it, what likelihood or probability is there, that we may have greater certainty of Apostolical Tradition, than of the Writings

Μη γὰρ ἐν ἐκείνῳ μόνον τῷτο πα-
ραστήσαντες, ἀλλὰ καὶ περὶ πολλὰ κατὰ
τὴν πρὸς ἡμᾶς ἐπιστολὴν ἐν ταῖς πο-
λυθροτότοις ἐκκλησίαις καὶ ταῖς
Συνάκταις τῶν ἀδελφῶν ἐν Ἰκονίῳ καὶ
Συνάκταις, &c. Apud Euseb. Hist.
Eccles. l. 7. c. 7.

altho' Firmilian say,

Quod totum nos jam pridem in Iconii qui
Phrygiae loc. ut est collecti in unum convenien-
tibus ex Galatia & Cilicia, & ceteris proxi-
mis regionibus confirmavimus. Cyp. ep. 75.

Ubi pronomen Nos non de ipsius Firmiliani
persona, sed potius de ejus decessoribus acci-
piendum est. Valef. not. in Euseb. l. 7. c. 7.

Verum etiam omnes fere (Ecclesiae) quae in
Oriente magno numero Christianam piete-
tem professantur. Rigalt. not. in Cyp. p. 143.

Ceterum nos veritati & consuetudinem jun-
gimus, & consuetudini Romanorum, consu-
tudinem sed veritati opponimus; ab initio
hoc tenentes, quod a Christo & ab Apostolo
traditum est. ep. 75. Cyp. p. 164. ed.
Rigalt. V. etiam Basil. ep. prima Canon.
ad Amphilochem. Tom. 2. p. 759.

And Vincentius Liri-
nensis still takes Stephens part; and all that he hath to say, is, That that is

Idq; esse proprium Christiana modestia &
gravitatis, non sua posteris tradere, sed a
majoribus accepta servare. Ibid.

Quae sunt sunt a Vincentio verissime ac pru-
dentissime pronuntiata, si non alia sint a ma-
joribus tradita, quam quae majores ab Aposto-
lo susceperunt: Ceterum, sub nomine ac per-
sona majorum, per fatuos aut Sophistas, asini-
na aut Sophistica pro Apostolica traderen-
tur. Rigalt. observ. in Cydrian. p. 147.

of the *Apostles*? Especially in such matters as these are, in which it is very questionable, whether the *Apostles* had any occasion ministred to them to determine any thing in them. And therefore when *Stephen* at *Rome*, and those of his party pleaded custom, and consequently, as they thought *Apostolical Tradition*; it was not irrationally answered on the other side by *Cyprian* and *Firmilian*, that that might be, *Because the Apostles had not occasion given them to declare their minds in it*, because either the Heresies were not of such a nature as those of *Marcion* and *Cerdon*, or else there might not be such returnings from those *Heresies* in the *Apostolical times* to the Church; which being of so black a nature, as to carry in them such malignity, by corrupting the lives of Men by vicious practices, there was less probability either of the *true Christians Apostatizing* into them, or the recovery of such

Quantum ad id pertinet quod Stephanus dixit, quasi Apostoli eos qui ab heresi veniant baptizari prohibuerint, & hoc custodiendum posteris tradiderint, plenissime vos respondistis; Neminem tam stultum esse, qui hoc credat Apostolos tradidisse, quando etiam ipsas hereses contra execrabiles et detestandas postea exstiterint. Firmil. ep. Cyp. 75.

Apostoli autem nihil quidem exinde preceperunt, sed consuetudo illa quæ opponebatur Cypriano, ab eorum traditione exordium sumpsisse credenda est: sicut sunt multa quæ universa tenet Ecclesia, & ob hoc ab Apostolis præcepta bene creduntur, quamquam scripta non reperiantur. Aug. c. Donat. l. 5. c. 23.

who were fallen into them. To this purpose *Firmilian* speaks, *That the Apostles could not be supposed to prohibit the baptizing of such which came from the Hereticks, because no Man would be so silly, as to suppose the Apostles did prohibit that which came not in question till afterwards.* And therefore *S. Augustine*, who concerned himself the most in this Controversie, when he saw such ill use made of it by the *Donatists* doth ingenuously confess, *That the Apostles did determine nothing at all in it; but however (saith he) that custom which is opposed to Cyprian, is to be believed to have its rise from the Apostles Tradition; as there are many other things observed in the Church, and on that account are believed to have been commanded by the Apostles al-*

though they are no where found written. But, what cogent argument doth *S. Austin* use to perswade them this was an *Apostolical Tradition*? He grants, they determined nothing in it, yet would needs have it believed, that an *Universal Practice* of succeeding ages should imply such a determination, tho' unwritten. But, 1. The *Universal Practice* we have seen already, was far from being evident, when not only the *African*, but the *Eastern Church* did practise otherwise, and that on the account of an *Apostolical Tradition* too. 2. Supposing such an *Universal Practice*, How doth it thence follow, that it must be derived from the *Apostles*; unless it be first prov'd, that the *Church* could never consent in the use of any thing, but what the *Apostles* commanded them? Which is a very unreasonable supposition, considering the different emergencies which might be in the *Churches* of *Apostolical* and succeeding times, and the different reasons of *Practice* attending upon them, with that great desire which crept into the *Church* of representing the things conveyed by the Gospel in an external symbolical manner, whence, in the second Century, came the use of many baptismal Ceremonies, the *præputatio mellis & lactis*, as *Tertullian* calls it, and several of a like nature, which by degrees, came into the *Church*: Must we now derive these, and many other customs of the *Church* necessarily from the *Apostles*, when, even in *S. Austin's* time, several customs were supposed to be grounded on *Apostolical Tradition*, which yet are otherwise believed now? As in that known Instance of *Infants Participation* of the *Eucharist*, which is otherwise determined by the *Council of Trent*; and, for all that I know, the arguments used against this Tradition by some Men, may as well hold against *Infant-Baptism*; for there is an equal incapacity as to the exercise of all acts of reason and understanding in both: and, as the Scripture seems to suppose such acts of grace in one as have their foundation in the use

use of *reason*, it doth likewise in the other, and I cannot see sufficient evidence to the contrary; but if that place, *Except a Man be born of water, and of the Spirit, he shall not enter into the Kingdom of Heaven*, taken in the sense of the *Fathers*, doth imply a necessity of *Baptism* for all, and consequently of *Children*; that other place, *Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you*, taken likewise in the sense of the *Fathers*, will import the necessity of a participation of the *Eucharist* by *Infants* as well as others. I speak not this with an intention to plead either for this, or for the rebaptizing *Hereticks*, but to shew the great uncertainty of knowing *Apostolical Traditions*, some things having been taken for such, which we believe were not so, and others which could not be known whether so or no, by the ages next succeeding the *Apostles*. And therefore let any reasonable person judge what probability there is in what you drive at, that *Apostolical Traditions* may be more easily known than *Apostolical Writings*.

By which it appears, (3.) How vain and insufficient your reasons are, *Why Traditions should not be so liable to corruption as the Scriptures*. 1. You say, *Universal Traditions are recorded in Authors of every succeeding age: and it seems more incident to have the Bible corrupted than them, because of its bulk and passing through the hands of particular Men; whereas universal and immemorial Traditions are openly practised and taken notice of by every one in all ages*. To which I answer, 1. That you give no sufficient reason why the Bible should be corrupted. 2. And as little why Tradition should be more preserved than that. Two Accounts you give why the Bible might be corrupted by errors, *because of its bulk, and passing through the hands of particular Men*. But do you think it impossible, or at least unreasonable, to suppose that a Book of no greater bulk than the Bible, should, by the care and vigilancy of Men, through the assistance of *Divine Providence*, be preserved from any material corruptions or alterations? Surely, if you think so, you have mean thoughts of the *Christians* in all ages, and meaner of *Divine Providence*: For, you must suppose God to take no care at all for the preservation of a Monument of unspeakable concernment to the good of mankind; and you must conceive the *Christians*, in all ages, to be stupendiously careless and negligent, either in transcribing, or reading the *Scriptures*, which could suffer errors to slip into them, without discovery of them. Do you think that the *Christians* had no higher esteem of the *Scriptures*, than of the Use of *Altars*. or any other of your immemorial Traditions? But, say you, *The one were publick, and the other passed through the hands of particular Men*. It should seem then, their *Altars* were upon high places, but the *Scriptures* were only read in corners, never any such thing being publickly read as the Bible; so that any alteration might be there, and no notice at all taken of it. The poor *African Bishop* found the contrary to his sorrow, who was in such danger from the people, for altering but one word according to *S. Hieron's Translation*, as *S. Austine* reports the story. But, suppose it passed through the hands of particular Men, Was it therefore more liable to be corrupted? I should think just the contrary; unless you could suppose all those particular Men to agree in corrupting it, which, considering the difference of opinions, capacities, and interests, is a most unreasonable supposition; that some verbal and literal mistakes might slip in, you might rationally imagine, but that therefore any great corruptions should creep into it, argues your mean thoughts both of *God's Providence*, and the care of the *Christian world*. Well, but still it is impossible to corrupt your Traditions. It were a much harder matter to free your Traditions from being corruptions themselves of the purity of the *Christian Church*. And why so hard for them to be corrupted? Be-

cause recorded in Authors of every succeeding age. I had thought, all Books of equal, or much bigger bulk than the Scripture, had been as liable to corruption as that; but it seems not. If a Book be written of Traditions, the very Traditions will preserve it pure, tho' as big as that *Livy, Quem mea vix totum bibliotheca capit*, but that is not all, it seems these Traditions are recorded in Authors of every succeeding age: Unhappy Men we that cannot find them there! I wish, instead of writing *Controversies*, you would write the *history* of these Traditions; but, be sure to deduce them through the Authors of every succeeding age; and, I suppose, you mean, ever since the Apostles. I shall then indeed believe *Popish Traditions* to be no *Novelties*, but not before. But, let us grant this: Were not the Scriptures attested by the same Authors? No, *It seems, they were agreed about all Traditions, but not so about the Scriptures.* And the reason is, *Because the Scriptures were first delivered to private Men, as S. John's Epistle, and S. Luke's Gospel; but Traditions had an universal practice.* But, Can you suppose it otherwise, but that particular Books must be first delivered to private Men? Would you have them delivered only to General Councils, or the Pope, and his Cardinals? It seems S. John was to blame for not directing his Epistle to the Pope, instead of *Gaius*; and S. Luke his Gospel to a General Council, instead of *Theophilus*; for then we might have had *Infallible Certainty* of them; but now it is a plain case, we can have no more than *Moral Certainty* that ever they were theirs. But, for this trick, it seems, they fared the worse; for some Books were doubted of, for many years, in particular Churches. It is well yet, they were not discarded by your Catholick Church, because the Apostles did not put their Books into your hands to recommend them. But what if some Books, by some Men, were for some time doubted of, which yet were afterwards universally received upon sufficient evidence? *Why then (say you) Tradition hath much advantage of Scripture.* How so? Was no Tradition, which would be accounted *universal*, doubted of by any Men at any time? No (say you) *it is impossible it should, for universal Traditions were universally practised at all times.* Now you speak home; and nothing wants to the proof of it, but only to let us know, What these *Universal Traditions* are, which were so universally practised in all ages, containing things different from Scripture, which are recorded in the Authors of every succeeding Age. Your offer is so fair, that my request shall be very short; *name them, and prove them*, and I will believe you, but not before. So much for this, which, tho a digression in this Chapter, yet is not from the design of this discourse.

- s. 6. Setting aside therefore your discourse about A. C's Pen being troubled, in which is nothing worth our notice; I come to the main dispute of this Chapter, which is, *Whether the Promises of Infallibility made to the Apostles, are to be restrained to their own times, or to be extended to the present Church in all ages?* We assert the former, and you the later. For which you produce this Argument, *That from these very places, Christians do infer, that the Church shall never fall away and perish. For if the assistance be not to preserve the succeeding Church, at least from some kind of errors infallibly; it may notwithstanding all the assistance he allows it here, fall into all kind of errors one after another, and so by degrees, the whole Church might fall into a general Apostasie, and thereby perish. There must therefore be some kind of infallible assistance in the Apostles successors, by virtue of these Promises.* But, 1, Is it all one to say, *There shall always be a Church*, and to say; *That Church shall always be infallible?* Those, who from the places in question,

question, do prove, that the *Church* shall never quite *fall away*, do not dream of a *present Infallibility* in your sense, but that there always shall be a number of Men professing *Christianity* in the World: And, Cannot you possibly conceive, that there should be such a number of Men professing *Christianity* without *Infallibility*? To help therefore your understanding a little; suppose that all the Members of the *Roman Church* should in one Age be destroyed (and, according to your former Principle, that *if a Church may err, we cannot be certain but that it doth err*; because this may be, we cannot be certain but that it is) but we only make the supposition: Do not you think that there would be still a number remaining, who profess *Christianity*, of the *Greek and Protestant Churches*? Yet, I hope, you will not say, that these were *Infallible*. There may be then a number of *Christians*, who are not *Infallible*; and that is all which is meant by saying, *That the present Church is Infallible in Fundamentals*, viz. that there shall always be a *Church*, for that which makes them a *Church*, is the belief of *Fundamentals*; and if they believe not them, they cease to be so. That therefore which being supposed, a *Church* is, and being destroyed, it ceaseth to be, is the formal constitution of it; but thus it is as to the *Church*, the belief of *Fundamentals* makes it a *Church*, and the not belief of them makes them cease to be a *Christian Church*; I speak of an *Essential* and not of an *Organical Church*; and, I know not who those Persons are, who, out of those places, do infer the perpetuity of an *Organical Church*; nor, if they did, doth it thence follow, they must suppose an *Infallible Assistance*, beyond an *Essential* to make it an *Organical Church*. For I cannot imagine what necessity can be supposed of *Infallibility*, in order to that which may be sufficiently constituted without it. 2. I answer, the perpetuity of the *Church* doth rather argue the *Infallibility* of the *Promise* than of the *Church*. Which if you did consider, you would not certainly infer *Infallibility* from a *Promise* of *Perpetuity*. For all the *Infallibility* supposable in this case is an *Infallibility* of *Accomplishment* of the *Promise* made. As in a clear and parallel Instance ^{Gen. 49. 10.} of that *Promise*, *The Scepter shall not depart from Judah, nor a Lawgiver from between his feet, until Shiloh come*. Taking it in the most received Interpretation among *Christians*, that the *Jewish Polity* should remain till the days of the *Messias*; doth this infer, that there should be a continual *Infallibility* in the *Jewish Polity*, because there was a *Promise* made of its *Perpetuity*? When God saith, *In Jerusalem have I set my name for ever*, doth it follow that *Jerusalem* should be always *Infallible*? But how would you triumph beyond all reason, if you had but any thing like such a promise for *Rome*, as that is for *Jerusalem*? Supposing then that the *Promises* by you insisted on, should be so far extended, as to imply a *perpetuity* of a *Christian Church*, what doth that argue, but only this, that to make it appear that *Promise* is infallibly true, there shall always be a succession of *Christians* in the World? 3. Suppose I should grant that the *Being* of a *Christian Church* doth suppose the *assistance* of *God's Spirit*, is there no *assistance* but what is *Infallible*? If not, no one can be a *Christian* without *Infallibility*; For we speak of no other *assistance*, but what is necessary to make Men *Christians*; for, what makes them such severally, take them conjunctly makes them a *Church*. But if you, besides what *assistance* is requisite to make them *Christians*, do suppose somewhat more to make them a *Church*, I pray name *what it is*; and whatever it be, it will not be owned by such who infer a perpetuity of a *Church* out of these places. But if in order to that no more be meant, (as no more can be meant) than what

is necessary to make Men *Christians*, then *Infallibility* will grow so cheap and common, it will not be worth challenging by you for your Church.

4. Suppose I grant this Assistance to be *Infallible*, doth all *Infallible Assistance* make an *Infallible Testimony*? I am sure not in their sense, who say the Church is *Infallible in Fundamentals*, for they never offer to assert that the present Church is *Infallible* in defining what are *Fundamentals*, and what not. And this is the only *Infallibility* in question, viz. Such a one as makes the Testimony of those who have it *Infallible*. For such a kind of assistance was that of the *Apostles*, which is only the thing enquired after. If you can therefore prove such an *Infallibility* in your Churches Testimony, as the *Apostles* had, you do something; but what is short of this, is nothing at all to the purpose. 5. Suppose I should grant the Testimony of the *Catholick Church* to be *Infallible*, yet all the Concessions were nothing for your advantage, unless you could as evidently prove that your Church is the only *Catholick Church*. Which that you can never do, will appear when we come to that Question. 6. Suppose I should yield the *Catholick Churches Testimony* to be *Infallible*, and your Church to be the *Catholick Church*; yet all this is far from proving Pope, or Council, or both to be *Infallible*. For, By what means come they to claim the *Infallibility* as belonging to them which is given to the Church? By what deeds are the conveyances settled of the *Priviledges* of the Church to them? Where is it ever said in *Scripture*, or in the least intimated, that the *Promises* made to the Church are to be understood of the *representative Church*? The *Apostles* had this Promise in their personal *Capacities* made to them, and not in a *representative*; how comes then the Promise to be understood of a *representation* afterwards? Thus you see, that you are at least *six removes* from any title to claim this *Infallibility* from these *Promises* by: And therefore you have little hopes that your claim should be admitted upon so slender a Title.

S. 7.

P. 94.
P. 99.

From this therefore at present you fly off, to the vindicating A. C. from asserting *Infallibility* belonging to all the *Doctors* and *Pastors* of the Church; which yet is a very good design to vindicate a Man from his own words. For are they not as exprefs as may be, viz. That there is the Promise of Christ, and his Holy Spirits continual presence, Luke 10. 16. Matth. 28. 19, 20. John 14. 16. not only to the *Apostles*, but to their *Successors* also, the lawfully sent *Pastors* and *Doctors* of the Church in all Ages? To which his Lordship saith, Here's a deal of *Infallibility* indeed, and yet error store. You presently cry out, But what shall we say to an Adversary that forges what Chimerical Doctrine he pleases, and then fights against it? What Chimerical Doctrine is that which he forges? Doth he not relate A. C.'s words? And do you, or can you, deny them to be his words? But, say you, This was not his meaning. I suppose you mean, That his words as they are, are not defensible, and therefore you must have a *συνδυασμα* for them: Which is, That he did not understand these words of every Doctor apart, but of Pastors and Doctors lawfully assembled in Oecumenical Councils. But, 1. Are Pastors and Doctors never lawfully sent, but when they are in Oecumenical Councils? For it is plain A. C. speaks of them as lawfully sent. 2. Have Pastors and Doctors met in Oecumenical Councils in all Ages? I would you could prove a truly Oecumenical Council in any Age; but sure you never pretend to it in all Ages, yet if A. C.'s words have any sense in them, they speak of such an Infallibility, as belongs to the Church in all Ages. And therefore this Plaister is a great deal too narrow to cover the Sore. But, say you, Every Author is to be understood to mean by his words, what they will properly bear; and is consonant with the meaning of his other words. I

most

most freely grant you this and all that follows, if you will prove it impossible for any Man to speak *non-sense*, or *contradictions*; But I can more easily prove it very possible for a Man to speak things which *contradict* one the other, which I have sufficiently proved from your own dear self in this very Discourse of *Infallibility*. What follows concerning the Jesuits pretence of *Infallibility to themselves* (proved by his Lordship, from the words of the Apologist, to whom Casaubon replies in his Epistle to Fronto Ducæus, which are these, *Let day and night — life and death be joyned together, and then there will be some hope that Heresie may fall upon the Person of a Jesuite*) is very well worth the observing, were it only for that rare and incomparable answer, which you make to them. In which, it is hard to guess whether your ingenuity or your wit surpass the other. Rabbi Casaubon, *καὶ ὁ ἄλλος καὶ ὁ ἄλλος*, must help him out. An Apologist, saith Casaubon, *avers, 'tis impossible for a Jesuite to err. Who is this Anonymus Apologist? A Jesuite or a Minister? For an Apologist and a Jesuite, are no more convertible terms, than a Jesuite, or a Minister. How shall we know then, whether this nameless Apologist was a Jesuite, or a Minister personating a Jesuite? The Gospel will tell us: Ex fructibus eorum cognoscetis eos.* O rare Drollery! doth this pass for Wit at Rome? Or must we think you speak these words in good earnest? If so, your Ignorance is more than ordinary in these matters. For to pass by your unworthy reflection on that excellent Person Isaac Casaubon, whose memory is as far above your detraction, as his Learning beyond your reach; and, to let go your scurrilous Greek Proverb, *καὶ ὁ ἄλλος καὶ ὁ ἄλλος* (which some will tell you was Greek for a Jesuite) are you really so ignorant, that you did not know whether the Apologist, whose words are cited, were a Jesuite or a Minister? What not he, who professedly undertakes the *Vindication of the Jesuites*? Not he, who was so seriously recommended by Fronto Ducæus a Jesuite himself? Not he, who industriously vindicates Ribadeneira, Scribanus, Emanuel Sa, Bellarmine, and others, in their Doctrine which doth most reflect on the Power and Authority of Princes? Not he, who extols Father Garnet who was executed in England for the Gunpowder-Treason, yet for all this not he known to be a Jesuite? Are you yet to seek? Apply but your own rule of the Gospel to what is said already, and by those Fruits you cannot but know him to be a Jesuite.

p. 100.

But now, notwithstanding the sufficient answers which have been so often given to the places produced for the proof of the Churches *Infallibility* out of Scripture, you thought it no needless trouble in A. C. to mention them, and much less in your self to vindicate them from the Bishops interpretation: The places are Luke 10. 16. *He that heareth you heareth me, and he that despiseth you despiseth me*, Maith. 28. 20. *I am with you always to the end of the world*, John 14. 16. *The Comforter the Holy Ghost shall abide with you for ever*. That which you would infer from these places, is, *That an Infallible Assistance is promised to the Church in all Ages, not in its diffusive sense but representative, viz. in the Pastors and Doctors assembled in Council*. The substance of his Lordship's answer to these places, is in these words; *These promises were made of continual presence and assistance, that I grant; and they were made to the Apostles and their Successors, that I grant too, but in a different degree. For it was of continual and Infallible assistance to the Apostles, but to their Successors of continual and fitting assistance, but not Infallible*. To this you return no answer in general, but endeavour to evince the contrary from the particular places, by disproving his Interpretations of them. To the first therefore, Luke 10. 16. *He that heareth you heareth me, &c.* His Lordship answers, *That this was absolutely true*

s. 8.

P. 93. n. 28.

in

in the Apostles, who kept themselves to that which was revealed by Christ; but it was to be but conditionally true in their Successors, i. e. so long and so far as you speak my words and not your own. For where the command is for
 Matth. 28. Preaching, the Restraint is added. Go, saith Christ, and teach all Nations;
 20. But you may not Preach all things that you please, but all things which I have
 P. 101. commanded you. The Publication is yours, the Doctrine is mine; and where the Doctrine is not mine, there your Publication is beyond, or short of your Commission. To this you reply, That this is rather to pervert our Saviour's words, than to interpret them, is manifest. And the reason you give, is, Because a Sectary, who denies the Apostles Infallibility as well as the Churches, might apply this restraint to the Apostles themselves, as well as he now applies it to their Successors. But they are strange kind of Sectaries indeed who deny the Apostles Infallibility, and my memory doth not serve me with any such who asserted Christ's Infallibility and denied the Apostles; but if there be any such Sectaries, let us know them, that we may then say, There are some in the World who believe great absurdities as well as you. However let us for the present, take this for a supposition, that any Men might do so; whether then they might not say, the Apostles were only Infallible when they spake Christ's words and not their own, i. e. delivered his Doctrine and not any other. No doubt they might, and said very well in it too. And if these be the Sectaries you mean, I am one of them my self; For I believe, the Apostles were no further Infallible than as they delivered Christ's Doctrine to the World, and I suppose there are many such Sectaries besides my self. But all the difference then between the Apostles and their Successors was this, that those who heard the Apostles Doctrine had ground to believe them Infallible in what they delivered for Christ's Doctrine; but we have no ground to believe so of any Church since the Apostles times, that it is Infallible in delivering the Doctrine of Christ to others. The promise then of Infallible Assistance as made to the Apostles, doth imply that God's Spirit would be so with them, that they should deliver nothing for the revealed Will of God or the Doctrine of Christ, but what was really and truly so. And if you can from this or any other place prove such an Infallible Assistance to the Church of all Ages, you do something, but not otherwise. But for this particular place, He that heareth you heareth me; I have something more yet to say, which may manifest how wholly impertinent it is to your purpose. 1. It seems to me very questionable, whether any such thing as Infallibility be at all implied in this place: And then certainly from hence you cannot infer a successive Infallibility in the Church. And the reasons why I question it, are, 1. The Apostles themselves had not that continual Infallible Assistance of the Spirit of God till after Christ's Ascension, when the promise of Christ's sending his Spirit upon them was remarkably accomplished, Will you say then they had Infallible Assistance by the Spirit, before the promise of that Infallible Assistance was made to them? If then the Apostles themselves had not such a continual Infallible Assistance, much less the LXX Disciples who are here spoken of. 2. The message they were sent upon did not at all require any Infallible Assistance, for it was only a preparative message, they not being sent to deliver fully the Doctrine of Christ, but to tell them, The Kingdom of God is at hand, or nigh unto you. Verse 9, 11. i. e. that blessed state of things under the Messias is now ready to be revealed to you: The whole design therefore of that Commission of the LXX Disciples and the Apostles, when they were first sent abroad, was of the same nature with John Baptists, viz. to prepare People for the reception and entertainment of that Doctrine which Christ should deliver to them.

them. Now what *Infallible assistance* can be supposed necessary in order to this? 3. The words imply nothing of *Infallible assistance* in them. For when *Christ* saith, *He that heareth you heareth me, and he that despiseth you despiseth me, and he that despiseth me, despiseth him that sent me*: the plain meaning is no more than this, They which hearken to your message, and believe the *truth* of what you say, do therein manifest their *readiness* to hearken to me, and consequently will receive my *Doctrine*, when it is delivered to them; but they who despise this message of yours, the *affront* they offer you, reflects most on me who *sent* you; and they shall find to their sorrow, that in *rejecting me* they reject *God* too, who will punish them severely for it: which, that it is the meaning of the words, will very easily appear to any one that considers the scope and design of the place. Now is it not possible for any to declare their respect to *Christ* by receiving his *Messengers* without believing those *Messengers* to be *Infallible*? If that be possible, then what kind of *Infallibility* can you hence infer? 2. Suppose I should grant these *LXX. Infallible* in what they delivered, yet nothing can be hence drawn for the *Churches continual Infallibility*, because of the different reason of one from the other, and that will appear in these things. 1. These were immediately sent abroad by *Christ* himself, when there were no *Infallible writings* containing this *Doctrine*, made by himself or his *Apostles*. And was there not then much more reason for such an *Infallibility*, than there can be now? 2. These had sufficient *evidences* to attest that *Infallibility*, by that power of *Miracles*, which they had in curing diseases and casting out of *Devils*, *vers. 9, — 17*. And therefore those they were sent to had sufficient inducement to believe such an *Infallibility*, if they had pretended to it; when therefore you can prove the like of your *lawfully sent Doctors and Pastors*, either apart or in a *General Council*, you may then from hence argue something towards that *Infallibility*, but not before.

In your following words you acknowledge a difference in applying this Text to the *Apostles* and their *Successors*, *For it was true in every one of the Apostles apart, but it is not so in every one of these succeeding Pastors*; and for this you give these Reasons, 1. *Your adversaries and you are agreed in it, viz. That the Pastors apart are fallible*. 2. *'Tis manifest by experience, that many eminent Pastors have not only been erroneous, but heretical*. 3. *There is universal Tradition for it*. 4. *Plain Scripture for it, that even from themselves there should arise some that should speak perverse things*. These reasons I acknowledge to be so true, that, if you had expressed the *Pope* himself in them, you could not have proved his fallibility better, than by *Experience, Consent, and Scripture*. But yet you have two Reserves in a Corner, which mar all the rest, *viz. that from these places you make General Councils infallible, and, according to your most received persuasion, the Pope too*. Do you so indeed? and from these places? and both of them *Infallible*, whether they agree or not? But if our reasons be not stronger against any such *Infallibility* deducible from these places, than yours are for it (for I have not seen any) I am content to blind my understanding so much, if I can, as to believe what you say, *That to give reasons against your exposition is impossible*. But as your reason in all other things is weak, so in this it appears, that either your *ignorance* or your *confidence* is intolerable.

The next place, is, *Matth. 28. 20. I am with you always, even unto the end of the world*, To which his Lordship saith, *Yes most certain it is, present by his spirit; for else in bodily presence, he continued not with his Apostles but during his abode on earth. And this promise of his spiritual presence was*

P. 102.

S. 9.
P. 96.

their Successors; else why to the end of the world? The Apostles did not, could not live so long; But then to the Successors, the Promise goes no further than, *I am with you always*, which reaches to continual assistance, but not to Divine and Infallible. What say you now to this? Why forsooth, *It is the same answer as before, and therefore deserves no further refutation*. But doth it not deserve some further proof of your Infallibility from this place? Or are you content to let it go, because you cannot but see, that a spiritual presence and not infallible is hereby promised, either to the Apostles or their Successors, although from other places it appears, that the spiritual presence of Christ with his Apostles did extend to so high a degree, as to make them infallible in what they delivered for the Doctrine of Christ, but no place of Scripture doth assert so much of the Churches Infallibility. It is well then that you grant, that St. Gregory did not believe any infallible assistance in the Pastors of the Church; but (you say) *he understood it of them apart, to make which probable, you must produce some other places, where he saith otherwise of them in Council*. But how a gracious presence of Christ with his Church, which you grant Rhabanus Maurus meant by this place, should suppose a conjunctive infallibility of the Pastors as a necessary foundation and support of the Church dissusive, I confess is beyond my understanding, but at least you say, *it denies it not*: neither doth it deny that you or I are infallible; but doth it therefore follow that we are so? What places you produce (or rather bid us go seek for out of the Fathers) to prove that they, in effect, (it seems then, not evidently) do attribute infallibility to the Church (but by no means Divine infallibility, for this is more than the third time that you have forbid the Banes between those two words Divine and Infallible) will to any that reads them appear to be capable of proving no more than the Perpetuity of a Church in the world; but if any of them can do any better service, I doubt not, but we shall again meet with them, and therefore shall adjourn their consideration to a more convenient place. To prove that any of the Fathers have denied this place to extend to infallibility, is a very unreasonable thing, which you put the Bishop and his party upon, because they only deliver what they conceive the meaning of places to be, without reflections on any Heresies, but such as were most prevalent in their own times. And if your Church had in their time callenged Infallibility from such places, you might have heard of their Negative, which at present you put us unreasonably to prove.

- S. 10. Your answer to John 14. 16. only is, *that it must be understood in some absolute sense*; and doth not his Lordship say so too, viz. in regard of Consolation and Grace. But if you say, there can be no other absolute sense, but an infallible assistance, you would do well to prove it, and not barely to suppose it: and so likewise, what follows as to John 16. 13. (which his Lordship justly restrains to the Apostles alone) you tell us, *That you contend, that in whatsoever sense all truth is to be understood in respect of each Apostle apart, it is also to be understood in relation to their Successors, assembled in a full Representative of the whole Church*. That you contend, we grant; but we say, it is without sense or reason. And therefore come to examine

P. 103. n 5. what you produce for it. Your first reason, *Because the Representative of the Church in General Council, and the Bishop of Rome as Pastor of the whole Church, have equal power to oblige the Church to believe what they deliver, as each Apostle had*, is utterly denied, and must be more than barely supposed as it is here. Your second, which you call the Fundamental reason of this

- N. 6. Exposition is, in short, *That the preservation of the Church requires infallibility* in

in future Ages of the Church, as well as in the Apostles times, which is again utterly denied; and the next time you write, I pray prove your reasons well; and think not your confident producing things you know are denied by us, will serve for reasons against us. Before you can sufficiently prove that any rite of the Church, not mentioned in Scripture, had the Holy Ghost for its Author, especially when contrary to a custom expressed in Scripture, you must do more than produce a single testimony of St. Augustine for it; who was apt to suppose the Holy Ghost might be pleased with such things, which the Church, though not therein infallible, might consent in the practice of. Which certainly is far from supposing the Church to have infallible assistance with it, in delivering Doctrines of Faith; because some things might be used in the Church which the Holy Ghost might be supposed not displeased with, which is the utmost can be made of your Citation out of St. Austin.

It seems you were aware of that disparity between the Apostles times and ours, as to the pretence of *Infallibility*, because the Apostles were first to deliver this Doctrine to the World, and after to consign it by writing to future Ages; from whence it were easie to infer, there could not be that necessity of a *continual Infallible Assistance* in the Church, because the Doctrine infallibly delivered by them is preserved in the Church by the *Infallible Records* of it. But to this your answer is considerable. What P. 104. n. wise Man (say you) would go about to raise a stately Building for many Ages, 7. and satisfy himself with laying a Foundation to last but for a few years? Our Saviour the wisest of Architects, is not to be thought to have founded this incomparable Building of the Church upon Sand; which must infallibly have happened, had he not intended to afford his continual assistance also to the succeeding Pastors of the Church, to lead them, when assembled in a general Council, into all those truths wherein he first settled the Apostles. Whether you call this arguing for the Churches *Infallibility*, or libelling against our Blessed Saviour if he hath not done what you would have him, is hard to determine. I am sure, it is arguing *ab absurdo* with a witness; for if he hath not done, just as you fancy he should have done; he must venture to be accounted an *Ignoramus* and *Impostor* before, and here to do that which no wise Man would have done, viz. build a stately Fabrick, the Church, upon the Sands. So it seems you account the Prophets and the Apostles: For if the Apostle may be credited, we are built on the Foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief Corner-stone. And this is it you must mean by being built on the Sand; for herein it is plain, the Church is built on these, viz. that *Infallible Doctrine* which was delivered by them, but here is not one word, or the least intimation of an *inherent Infallibility* in the Church which was to be its foundation so as to secure it from all error. And this (say you) must infallibly happen, if there be not the same *Infallibility* in General Councils which was in the Apostles; for that I suppose must be the meaning of your last words, if they be to the purpose. But how groundless your pretence of the *Infallibility* of General Councils is, will appear when we come to that Subject; but have you so little of common sense and reason with you, as to suppose the Church presently, notwithstanding the Divine Revelation of the Doctrine of Christianity in Scripture to be built on Sand, if General Councils be not *Infallible*? Is there not sufficient ground to rely on the Doctrine of Christianity, supposing there never had been any General Council in the World? What was the Church built on before the Nicene Council, only on Sand? Surely the Wind and Billows of Persecutions would then have easily overturned it. What if through

through civil combustions in the *Empire* there could never have been any *Assemblies* of the *Bishops* afterwards, must the *Church* needs have fallen to the ground for want of *General Councils*? But why, I pray, must the *Infallibility* of the *Apostles* be compared only to a *foundation that can last but for few years*? Do you suppose that these *Apostles* never did commit their *Doctrine Infallibly* to *Writing*; or that these *Writings* of theirs did last but for a few years? Without one of these, it is hard to find out your meaning by those expressions. If you deny either of them, I shall readily prove them: But if you affirm both these (as if you are heartily a *Christian* you must do) with what face can you say that *Christ*, in making the *Apostles* infallible, did lay a *Foundation* but for a few years. But thanks be to God, although perverse and unreasonable Men are always quarelling with the methods of *Divine Wisdom* and *Goodness*, this *Foundation of the Lord* standeth sure still; and, as long as the *Infallible Doctrine of the Gospel* continues, the *Church* will be built on a stedfast and unmoveable *Rock*, which will prove a much surer *Foundation* than the *seven Hills of Infallibility*. But this is your grand and fundamental Mistake, to suppose a *Church* cannot continue without a *vital inherent Principle of Infallibility* in her self, which must be discovered by *Infallible Directions* from the *Head* of it: Whereas we grant the necessity of an *Infallible Foundation* of Faith, but cannot discern either from *Scripture*, *Reason*, or *Antiquity*, that there must be a living and standing *Infallible Judge*, which must deliver and interpret those *Infallible Records* to us. We grant then *Infallibility* in the *Foundation* of Faith, we assert the highest *Certainty* of the *Infallibility* of that *Foundation*, we declare that the owning of that *Infallible Foundation* is that which makes Men *Christians* (the *Body* of whom we call a *Church*) we further grant, that *Christ* hath left in his *Church* sufficient means for the preservation of it in *Truth* and *Unity*; but we deny that ever he promised such an *Infallibility* to be constantly resident in that *Church*, as was in the *Prophets* and *Apostles*; and that neither any intention of *Christ*, or any reason in the thing can be manifested, why such an *Infallibility* should be so necessary for the *Churches Preservation*, that without it the *Wisdom of Christ* must be questioned, and the *Church* built on a *Sandy Foundation*. Your Citation of *Vincentius Lirinensis* proves nothing but the *Churches* constancy in adhering to that *Doctrine of Faith*, which was delivered from the beginning; but how that should prove a *constant Infallibility*, I cannot understand, unless it is impossible that there should be any *Truth*, where there is no inherent *Infallibility*. Thus we see, what very little success you have in the attempt of proving the *Churches* continual *Infallibility* from *Scripture*.

S. 11.

From hence you proceed to the consideration of the way, How *Scripture* and *Tradition* do mutually confirm each other. His Lordship grants, That
 P. 98. E. they do mutually, but not equally, confirm the Authority either of other. For
 31. *Scripture* doth infallibly confirm the authority of *Church-Traditions*, truly so called: But *Tradition* doth but morally and probably confirm the authority of the
 P. 105. *Scripture*. This (say you) is apparently false, but endeavour not to make it evident, that it is so: Only you say, A. C. refused already to grant it. Et quid tum postea? Must every thing be false which A. C. refuses to grant? But let us see, whether his *Similitude* makes it out. For (saith he) 'Tis as a *King's* *Embassadours* word of mouth, and his *King's* *Letters* bear mutual witness to each other. Just so indeed (saith his Lordship) For his *King's* *Letters* of Credence under Hand and Seal, confirm the *Embassadours* authority infallibly to all that know his Seal and Hand: But the *Embassadours* word of mouth confirms his *King's* *Letters*, but only probably. For else, Why are they call'd *Letters* of Credence,

Credence, if they give not him more credit, than he gives them? To which you make a large reply. 1. That the King's Hand and Seal cannot confirm infallibly to a Foreign King, who neither knows hand nor Seal, the Embassadors Authority; and therefore this reacheth not the business, How we should know infallibly, that the Scripture is God's Word. 2. That the primary Reason, Why the Embassador is admitted, is his own credit, to which correspond the motives of Credibility of the Church, by which the Letters of Credence are admitted. 3. That none can give authority to the Letters of Credence, or be Infallibly certain of them, but such as Infallibly know that Hand and Seal. 4. That none can Infallibly know that Hand and Seal, but such as are certain of the Embassadors sincerity. But, Doth all this disprove what his Lordship saith, That though there be a mutual Testimony, yet it is not equal; for, although the Letters of Credence might be the sooner read and admitted of, on the Embassadors Reputation and Sincerity, yet still those Letters themselves, upon the delivery of them, may further, and in a higher degree, confirm the Prince he is sent to, of his authority to act as Embassador. Supposing then, that there be a sufficient Testimony, that these Letters were sealed by the Secretary of State, who did manifest his Sincerity in the highest manner in the sealing of them; though a Foreign Prince might not know the Hand and Seal, yet upon such a credible Testimony, he may be assured that they were sealed by the Prince himself. But then withal, if the Embassador, to assure the Prince, offers his own Life to attest the truth of his Credentials, and the Prince by reading the Letters, find something in them which could not be written by any other than that Prince, he then hath the highest certainty he can desire. This is the case between Tradition and Scripture, General Tradition at first makes way for the first admission of Scripture, as the general repute of an Embassadors coming doth for his access to the Prince; the particular Tradition of the Church, is like the Embassadors affirming to the Prince, that he hath Letters of Credence with him; but then, when he enquires into the Certainty of those Letters, those Motives of Credibility (not which relate to the Person of the Embassador) but which evidently prove the sealing of those Letters (as the constant Testimony of such who were present at it, the Secretaries and Embassadors venturing their lives upon it) must confirm him in that; and lastly, his own reading the Credentials, give him the highest Confirmation, i. e. The Testimony of those who saw the Miracles of Christ and his Apostles, and confirmed the Truth of their Testimony, by their dying for it, are the highest inducement to our believing that the Scriptures were sealed by God himself in the Miracles wrought, and written by his own hand, his Spirit infallibly assisting the Apostles; but still, after all this, when in these very Scriptures we read such things as we cannot reasonably suppose could come from any but God himself; this doth in the highest degree settle and confirm our Faith. Therefore, as to the main scope for which this Similitude was used by his Lordship, it holds still; but your mistake lies, in supposing that the Embassadors reception depended wholly on his own single Testimony, and that was enough to make any Prince infallibly certain that his Letters of Credence are true, which cannot be, unless he knows before-hand that Embassador to be infallibly true; which is impossible to be supposed at his first reception. Yet this is plainly your case, that the Scriptures are to be infallibly believed on the single Testimony of the present Church, which is, to make the Embassador himself give authority to his Letters of Credence, and set Hand and Seal to them. Whereas the contrary is most evident to be true. But then, supposing these Credentials admitted, the Prince transacts with the Embassador, according to that Power which is

conveyed to him therein. And thus it is in the present case: Not as though a Prince treated every *Envoy* with equal respect to an *Embassadour*, no more ought any *Pastors* of the Church be received, but according to that power and authority which their *Credentials*, viz. the *Scriptures* do convey to them. We own therefore the *Apostles* as God's immediate *Embassadours*, whose *Miracles* did attest their Commission from Heaven to all they came to; and no Persons could pretend ignorance that this is God's *Hand and Seal*; but all other *Pastors* of the Church we look on only as *Agents* settled to hold *correspondency* between God and Us, but not extraordinary *Embassadours*, who must be looked on as immediately transacting by the *Infallible Commission* of Heaven. When therefore the *Pastor* or *Pastors* of your Church shall bring new *Credentials* from Heaven, attested with the same *Broad seal* of Heaven, which the *Apostles* had, viz. *Miracles*, we shall then receive them in the same capacity as *Apostles*, viz. acting by an *Infallible Commission*, but not till then. By which I have given a sufficient Answer to what follows, concerning the credit which is given to *Christ's Legates* as to himself; for hereby it appears they are to have no greater authority than their *Commission* gives them. Produce therefore an *Infallible Commission* for your *Pastors Infallibility*, either apart, or conjunctly, and we shall receive it; but not else. Whether A. C. in the words following, doth in terms attribute *Divine and Infallible Authority* to the Church, supposing it infallibly assisted by the *Holy Ghost*, is very little material; for, Whether he owns it or no, it is sufficient that it necessarily follows from his Doctrine of *Infallibility*. For, How can the Church be infallible by virtue of those *Promises*, wherein *Divine Infallibility*, you say, is promised, and by virtue of which the *Apostles* had *Divine Infallibility*, and yet the Church not to be *Divinely Infallible*? The remainder of this Chapter, which concerns the *sense* of the *Fathers* in this Controversie, will particularly be considered in the next, which is purposely designed for it. g

CHAP. IX.

112:2-H

The Sense of the Fathers in this Controversie.

The Judgment of Antiquity enquired into, especially of the three first Centuries; and the Reasons for it. The several Testimonies of Justin Martyr, Athenagoras, Tatianus, Irenæus, Clemens Alexandrinus, and all the Fathers who writ in vindication of Christian Religion, manifested to concur fully with our way of resolving Faith. T. C.'s Answers to Vincentius Lirinensis, à Gandavo, and the Fathers produced by his Lordship, pitifully weak. The particulars of his ninth Chapter examined. St. Augustine's Testimony vindicated. T. C.'s nauseous Repetitions sent as Vagrants to their several homes. His Lordship's Considerations found too heavy for T. C.'s Answers. In what sense the Scripture may be called a Præcognitum. What way the Jews resolved their Faith. This Controversie, and the first Part, concluded.

§. 1.

HAVING thus largely considered, whatever you could pretend to, for the advantage of your own cause, or the prejudice of ours, from Reason and Scripture; nothing can be supposed to remain considerable, but the judgment of the *Primitive Church* in this present Controversie. And next to *Scripture* and *Reason*, I attribute so much to the sense of the *Christian Church* in the *Ages* next succeeding the *Apostles*, that it is no mean con-

confirmation to me of the truth of the *Protestant Way of Resolving Faith*, and of the *falsety of yours*, that I see the one so exactly concurring, and the other so apparently contrary to the unanimous *Consent of Antiquity*. For, though you love to make a great noise with *Antiquity*, among Persons meanly conversant in it; yet those who do seriously and impartially enquire into the sense of the *Primitive Church*, and not guess at it by the *Shreds of Citations* to your hands in your own writers (which is generally your way) will scarce in any thing more palpably discern your juggling and impostures than in your pretence to *Antiquity*. I shall not here enquire into the Corruptions crept into your *Church* under that *disguise*, but, as occasion is ministred to me, in the following discourse, shall endeavour to pluck it off, but shall keep close to the matter in question. Three things then I design in this Chapter.

1. To shew the Concurrence of *Antiquity* with us in the resolution of Faith.

2. Examine what you produce from thence, either to assert your own way, or enervate ours.

3. Consider what remains of this Controversie in your Book.

1. For the manifesting the Concurrence of *Antiquity* with us; I shall confine my present discourse to the most pure and genuine *Antiquity*, keeping within the compass of the *three first Centuries*, or at least, of those who have purposely writ in vindication of the *Christian Faith*. Not that I do in the least distrust the consent of the *succeeding Writers of the Primitive Church*, but upon these Reasons. 1. Because it would be too large a task at present to undertake, since no necessity from what you object, but only my desire to clear the *Truth*, and rectifie the *Mistakes* of such, who are led blindfold under the pretence of *Antiquity*, hath led me to this discourse. 2. Because in reason they could not but understand best the ways and methods used by the *Apostles* for the perswading Men to the *Christian Faith*; and if they had mentioned any such thing as an *Infallibility* always to continue in the *Church*, those *Pastors* certainly who received the care of the *Church* from the *Apostles* hands, could not but have heard of it: And were strangely to blame if they did not discover and make use of it. Whatever therefore of truly *Apostolical Tradition*, is to be relied on in such cases, must be conveyed to us from those Persons who were the *Apostles immediate Successors*; and if it can be made manifest that they heard not of any such thing, in that, when occasion was offered, they are so far from mentioning it, that they take such different ways of satisfying Men, which do manifestly suppose that they did not believe it. I know some of the greatest *Patrons* of the *Church of Rome*, and such who know best how to manage things with the best advantage for the interest of that *Church*, have made little account of the *three first Ages*, and confined themselves within the compass of the *four first Councils*, upon this pretence, because the *Books and Writers* are so rare before, and that those *Persons* who lived then, had no occasion to write of the matters in Controversie between them and us. But if the ground why those other things which are not determined in *Scripture*, are to be believed by us, and practised as necessary, be, that they were *Apostolical Traditions*, Who can be more competent *Judges* what was so, and what not, than those who lived nearest the *Apostolical times*? And those certainly (if they writ of any thing) could not write of any thing of more concernment to the *Christian World*, than the knowledge of such things would be; or at least we cannot imagine but that we should find express intimations of them, where so many, so wise, and learned

learned Persons do industriously give an account of themselves, and their solemn actions to their *Heathen Persecutors*. But however silent they may be in other things, which they neither heard, nor thought of, as in the Customs controverted between the *Papists* and us (which, no doubt, is the true reason why the *three first Ages* are declined by *Cardinal Perron*) yet there is not the least shadow of pretence, why they should be silent in this present Controversie, since the great business of their writings was to vindicate the *Christian Faith*, to persuade the *Heathens* to believe it, and to manifest the grounds on which they were induced to believe themselves. If therefore in this they do unanimously concur with that *Resolution of Faith* I have already laid down, nothing can be desired more for the evidence and confirmation of the truth of our way, than that it is not only most consonant to *Scripture*, but built on the truest *Reason*, and was the very same which the *Primitive Christians* used when they gave an account of their *Faith*: Which I shall do, not by some mangled *Citations*, but deducing it from the scope and design of their writings, and drawing it successively down from the first after the *Apostles*, who appeared in *Vindication* of the *Christian Faith*.

S. 2.
Phot. bibli-
oth. Cod.
234.

I begin with *Justin Martyr*, who, as *Photius* saith of him, was ἀπὸ τοῦ χρόνου πόρρω τῶν Ἀποστόλων, ὥς τῇ ἀρετῇ, not far from the *Apostles* either in time or virtue; and who being a professed *Philosopher* before he became a *Christian*, we may in reason think, that he was more inquisitive into the grounds of *Christian Faith*, before he believed, and the more able to give an account of them, when he did. Whether therefore we consider those *Arguments* which first induced him to believe, or those whereby he endeavours to persuade others to it, we shall find how consonant and agreeable he is to our grounds of *Faith*, how far from any imagination of the *Churches Infallibility*. In the beginning of his excellent *Dialogue with Trypho*, (if I may conjecture) he represents the manner of his Conversion in a *Platonical way*, introducing a solemn Conference between himself, and an ancient Person of great Gravity, and a venerable aspect in a solitary place, whither he was retired for his Meditations. *Pet. Halloix* is much troubled who this Person should be, Whether an *Angel* in humane shape, or a Man immediately conveyed by an *Angel* to discover *Christianity* to him, which when he had done, he was as suddenly carried back again. *Schultetus* (I suppose from the Story) asserts *Justin Martyr* to be converted by *Divine Revelation*. But, if I be not much mistaken, this whole Conference is no more than the setting forth the grounds of his becoming a *Christian* in the *Platonical Mode*, by way of *Dialogue* (and probably the whole *Disputation* with *Trypho*, may be nothing else) but, however that be, it is apparent *Trypho* looked on him as a *Platonist*, by his *Pallium*, and *Justin Martyr* owns himself to have been so, and therefore it was very congruous for him to discourse after the *Academick manner*. In which Discourse, when *Justin Martyr* had stood up in vindication of the *Platonick Philosophy*, the other Person endeavours to convince him of the impossibility of attaining true happiness by any *Philosophy*. For when *Justin* had said, That by *Philosophy* he came to the *Knowledge of God*; the other Person demanded, How they could know *God*, who had never seen him, nor heard of him? He replied, That the τὸ θεῖον was μόνον τῷ κατὰ λόγον, *God was only intelligible by our Minds*, as *Plato* said: He again asks, Whether there were such a Faculty in the Minds of Men, as to be able to see *God* without a *Divine Power and Spirit* assisting it? *Justin* answers, That according to *Plato*, the Eye of the Understanding was sufficient to discover

Pet. Hal-
loix in vit.
Just. Mart.
cap. 2. in
not.

Medulla
Patr. p. 9

discover that there is such a Being, which is the cause of all things, but the nature of it is ineffable and incomprehensible. Upon which he proceeds to enquire, What relation there was between God and the Souls of Men, and what means to come to the participation of him; after a great deal of discourse on which subject between them, Justin comes at last to enquire, if there were not truth and certainty in Philosophy, By whose instruction, or by what means he should come to it? To which that Person returns this excellent Answer,

That there had been, a long time since, several Persons much elder than the reputed Philosophers, blessed Men, just, and lovers of God, speaking by the Inspiration of the Divine Spirit, foretelling things which have come to pass since, whom they call Prophets. These only saw the Truth, and declared it to Men; neither flattering, nor fearing any, nor conquered with the love of honour: But they only spake the things which they heard and saw, being filled with the Holy Spirit. Whose Books are still extant; which, whosoever reads, and assents to, will find himself much improved in the principles and ends of things, and whatever becomes a Philosopher to know. For, they writ not by way of argument or demonstration, but, that which is above it, they are most faithful witnesses of Truth. For the things which have, and do come to pass, do enforce Men to believe the Truth of what they spake: And not only so, but they are most worthy to be believed, for the Miracles which they wrought. Moreover, they extol the Maker of the World, God and the Father, and declare to the World his Son Christ: Which the false Prophets, who are acted by a seducing and impure Spirit, neither have done, nor yet do do; but they attempt to shew some tricks for the amazement of Men, and cry up the evil and deceiving Spirits. But, do thou, above all things, pray, that the gates of light may be opened to thee. For these things are not seen nor understood by all, but only by them to whom God and Christ shall grant the knowledge of them. A most signal and remarkable Testimony (as any is extant in all Antiquity) for acquainting us with the true Grounds and Reasons of Faith, which therefore I have at large produced. The very reading of which is sufficient to tell us, How true a Protestant this, whether Angel or Man, was. When Justin asked him, What Teachers he should have to lead him to Truth; He tells him, There had been long before Philosophers, excellent Persons in the World, called Prophets, Men every way good, who did nothing for Fear, or Favour, or Love of themselves. But Justin might further ask, How he should come to be instructed by them? He tells him, Their Writings were still extant, wherein were contained such things as might hugely satisfy a Philosophical Mind, concerning the Origine and Principles of things. He might still enquire, Whether those things were demonstrated or no, in them? No, he replies; but they deserve assent

Ἐγὼ νομίζω πως πρὸ πολλῆς χρόνου, πάντων τούτων τῶν νομιζομένων φιλοσόφων παλαιότεροι, μακάριοι καὶ δίκαιοι, καὶ θεοφιλεῖς, διὰ πνεύματος λαλήσαντες, καὶ τὰ μέλλοντα διαπορεύσας, αὐτὸν νῦν γινέσθαι, σεφῆτας δὲ αὐτὸς καλεῖσιν· οὗτοι μόνον τὸ ἀληθὲς καὶ εἶδον καὶ ἐξείπον ἀνθρώποις, μὴτ' εὐλαβηθέντες, μήτε δυσωπειθέντες πρὸς, μὴ ἡττημένοι διδῆς, ἀλλὰ μόνον ταῦτα εἰπόντες ἀπαύσαν καὶ αὐτοὶ, ἀγλαὰ πλερωθέντες πνεύματι. Συγγράμματα δὲ αὐτῶν ἐπὶ καὶ νῦν διαμένει, καὶ ἔστιν ἐκτελέχεια τέτοις πλείστον ἀφελιδύσαι καὶ ἀεὶ ἀρχῶν, καὶ ἀεὶ τέλους, καὶ ὧν χρὴ εἰδέναι τὸ φιλοσοφῶν, πρὸς αὐτὰ ἐκείνοις. ἔστι μὲν ἀποδείξεις ποικίλαι τότε τῶν λόγων, ὅτε ἀνωτέρω πάσης ἀποδείξεως ὄντες ἀξιόπιστοι μαρτυροῦντες τῆς ἀληθείας τὰ δὲ ἀποδείξαι καὶ ἀποδείκναι ἐξαναγκάζει συντίθεσθαι τοῖς λαλοῦσιν οἱ αὐτῶν καὶ τοῖγε καὶ διὰ τὰς δυνάμεις αἷς ἐπέβλεπον, πρὸς αὐτὰς δίκαιοι ἦσαν· ἐπειδὴ καὶ τὸ ποιεῖν τῶν ὅλων θεὸν καὶ πατέρα ἐδίδασκον, καὶ τὸ παρ' αὐτοῦ χρεῖσθαι οὐδὲν αὐτῶν κατήγγελλον, ὅπερ οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς πλάνης καὶ ἀκαταστάσεως πνεύματος ἐμπαλάμενοι φασὶν ἀπορροφῆται, ὅτε ἐποίησαν, ὅτε ποιεῖσιν, ἀλλὰ δυνάμεις τινὰς ἐνεργεῖν ἐξ ἀκαταστάσεως τῶν ἀνθρώπων τολμήσαντες καὶ τὰ τῆς πλάνης πνεύματα καὶ διαμύνοντα δοξολογῶσιν, ὥστε δὲ οὐ πρὸς πάντων, φωτὸς ἀνοιχθῆναι πύλας· ἔστι δὲ συνόψις, ἐστὶ συνόψις πάντων ὅτων, αἱ μὲν τὰς θεῶν συνίεναι καὶ ὁ χρεῖσθαι αὐτῶν. Justin. Martyr. Dialog. c. Tryph. p. 224, 225. ed. Paris. 1636.

as much, it not beyond any demonstration; because they manifest themselves to be from God, by two things, the exact accomplishment of the Prophecies made by them, and the unparallel'd Miracles which were wrought by them. But, might not the evil Spirits work such things? No: For, although their false Prophets may do several things to amaze Men, yet they can do no such Miracles as they did; besides, all which they do, tends to advance these evil Spirits in the World; but the design of the true Prophets, is to declare the True God, and his Son Christ. But, May then any one, by the innate power of his mind, yield a divine assent to these things? No: But, pray earnestly to God to enlighten your mind; for this is the effect of Divine Grace, in and through Christ. What part is there now of our resolution of Faith, which is not herein asserted? If you ask, Why you believe there were such Men in the World as these Prophets? The continuance of their Books and common Fame sufficiently attest it. If you ask, Why you should believe them to be true Prophets? The excellency of their Doctrine, joyned with the fulfilling Prophecies, and working Miracles, abundantly prove it. But if you lastly ask, Whether, besides objective evidence, there be not some higher efficient requisite to produce a Divine Faith; The Answer is, That depends upon the Grace of God in Christ: So that here we have most evidently all those things concurring, which his Lordship asserts in the resolution of Faith; Moral inducement preparing the Mind, rational evidence from the thing into which Faith is resolved, and Divine Grace requisite in the nature of an efficient cause. But, Where is there the least intimation of any Churches Infallibility requisite to make Men believe with a firm and Divine Faith? No doubt that was a Divine Faith, which Justin was bid to pray so heartily for, and which was only in those to whom it was given, and yet even this Faith had no other assurance to build it self upon, but that rational evidence which is before discovered. That Divine Person never thought of Mens believing with their Wills, much less that the Books of Scripture had no more evidence of themselves, than distinction of Colours to a blind Man; he did not think Christ an Ignoramus or Impostor, because he left no Church Infallible, nor that God by the Prophets laid a Foundation upon Sand, or that would last but a few Years, because he did not continue such an Infallible Assistance as the Prophets had to the Church in all Ages; yet these are all brave Assertions of yours; which, doubtless, you would be ashamed of, and recant, if you had not, as Casaubon saith of the Person whom you could not tell whether he was a Jesuite or no (but by that Character you might guess it) that he had *frontem ferream, & cor involutum*; a brow of Steel, and a Heart full of Meanders (to use your own fine expression.) Upon this, Justin tells us, a divine ardour was raised in his mind, and a love of the Prophets and such as were the Friends of Christ, and, upon further consideration, ταύτην μόνον εὐεσκον φιλοσοφίαν ἀσφαλῆ τε καὶ σύμφορον, I found this the only certain and profitable Philosophy; and thereupon commends the Doctrine of Christ to Trypho and his Company for something which was certainly innate to it, that it had a kind of awe and majesty in it, and is excellent at terrifying and perswading those who were out of the right way, and brings the sweetest tranquillity to such as are conversant in it. And afterwards undertakes

Παρεστὶ γὰρ δεῖξω, ὅτι ἡ κενὸς ἐπί-
σκόπη οὐ μύθοις, ἐδὲ ἀναποδείκτοις
λόγοις, ἀλλὰ μετὰ πνεύματος θεοῦ,
καὶ δυνάμει ἐργεῖται, καὶ τεθηλόσι χάριτι.
Id. p. 226.

to demonstrate the truth of our Religion from the reasonableness of it, that we have not yielded our assent to vain and empty Fables, nor to assertions incapable of evidence and demonstration; but to such as are filled with a Divine Spirit, overflowing with Power, and flourishing with Grace. And

accor-

accordingly manageth his discourse quite through, shewing the insufficiency of the Ceremonial Law, and the Truth and Excellency both of the Person and Doctrine of Christ. But what need all this, if he had believed your Doctrine? It had been but proving the Church Infallible by Motives of Credibility; and then to be sure, whatever was propounded to be believed by it, was infallibly true. But older and wiser, it seems, must hold here too; Justin, tho' so near the Apostles times, went a much further way about: but it was well for him he lived so long ago, else he might have been accused of Heresie, or making Faith uncertain, if he had lived in our times, and such Doctrine of his might have merited an Index Expurgatorius.

But, it seems, he was not afraid of it then, for he often elsewhere §. 3. speaks to the same purpose. For, in his *Paranesis* to the Greeks, he makes it his business, first to shew the unreasonableness of believing those who were the great Authors of all their superstitions; for the Poets were manifestly ridiculous, the Philosophers at continual dissensions among themselves, so that there was no relying on them for the finding out of Truth, or the redress of the miseries of humane nature; and then comes to the Authours Paranesis. p. of our Religion, who were both much elder than any of theirs, and did not teach any thing of their own heads, nor dissented from one another in what they delivered, or sought to confute each other as the Philosophers did, but ἀπολαύσαντες ἡ ἀσφαλισμένη, without all jarring and contention, they delivered to Men the Doctrine which they received from

God. For, (saith he) it was not possible for them to know such great and divine things by nature, or humane wit, but by a heavenly gift descending from above upon holy Men. It seems, Justin believed there was such evidence in the matters contained in Scripture, which might perswade Men to believe that they came from God; that they were but as instruments to that τὸ θεῖον πνεῦμα (as he expresseth it) to that Divine Spirit which did strike upon them; whence, with one consent and harmony they found forth the Doctrine of God, the worlds Creation and Man's, the Immortality of the soul, Judgement to come, and all things else which are necessary for us to know, which they unanimously deliver to us, though at great distances from each other, both in regard of time and place. And so proves the Antiquity of the Writings of Moses above all the Wise Men of the Greeks, by the testimony of their own Authors, Polemon, Ap-
pion, Ptolomæus Mendesiæ, and many others, and concludes his discourse with this speech, That it is impossible for us to know any thing certainly concerning God or Religion, but from Divine Inspiration, which alone was in the Prophets. In his first *Apology* for the Christians, he tells us what it was, while he was a Platonist, which brought him to a good Opinion of Christianity, which was, the observing the power and efficacy that Doctrine had Apolog. 1. upon the Christians to undergoe with so much courage what was accounted most terrible to humane nature (which are, death and torments.) From whence he reasoned with himself, that although the Christians were so much calumniated, yet certainly they could not be vitious persons, who were so little fearful of those great Bug-bears of humane nature. For, Who is there, that is a lover of pleasure, or intemperate, or cruel, that can cheerfully embrace death, so as thereby to be deprived of all his goods? And when he speaks of the Doctrine it self of Christianity, he says, It is suitable to whatever was rational among the Platonists or other Philosophers, but far more agreeable to it self, and con-

ὅτι καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἀνθρώπων ἐννοία
τὰ μεγάλα καὶ θεία γινώσκον ἀνθρώ-
ποις δύνασθαι, ἀλλὰ τῷ ἀνωθεν ἐκ τῆς
ἀγίας ἀνδρείας τιμωμένοι καὶ ἐκκλησιασ-
τικοί. Id. ib.

Τίς γὰρ φιλήσους, ἢ ἀκαταίς, καὶ ἀν-
θρώπων σαρκῶν παρὰ ἀγαθὸν ἡγή-
μενος, δύναται εἰς θάνατον ἀποδεχέ-
σθαι, ὅπως τὸν αὐτὸ ἀγαθὸν εὐρεθῇ.
Id. ib.

taining much more *excellent things* than ever they could attain to the knowledge of. In his second *Apology* for the *Christians* to the Emperor *Antoninus Pius*, he insists much on the excellency of the *Doctrine* of *Christianity* from the *Precepts* of it, *chastity*, *love of enemies*, *liberality*, *submission to authority*, *worship of God*, &c. Afterwards he proves the truth and certainty of all we believe concerning *Christ* from the exact accomplishment of the *Prophecies* made concerning him in the *Old Testament*, which discourse he ends with this saying. So many and so great things being seen,

Τὰ τοιαῦτα γὰρ ὁρώμενα, περὶ καὶ πρὸς τοὺς ἀληθεῖς ἀσπαζομένους, καὶ μὴ φιλοδοξῶντας, μηδὲ ὑπὸ πάθων ἀσπαζομένους, μετὰ λόγου ἐμφορῆσαι δύναται. *Apol.* 2. p. 89.

are sufficient to persuade Men to believe the truth of them, who are lovers of truth, and not seekers of applause, and under the command of passions. Thus we see, in all his discourses, where he had the most occasion administred to him, to discover the most certain grounds of *Christian Faith*, he resolves all into the rational evidence of the truth, excellency, and divinity of the *Doctrine* which was contained in the *Scriptures*. For in his second *Oration* to the *Greeks*, after he had spoken highly in commendation of the *Scripture*,

*Ὡς παθὼν δεινῶν πυρὰ δάκρυον, ὃ πρὸς ἐμψύχῃ σβεστικῶν διδασκαλεῖον. *Orat.* 2. p. 40.

calling it, *The best expeller of all turbulent passions*, and the surest extinguisher of those preternatural heats in the souls of Men; which (saith he) makes Men not Poets, nor Philosophers, nor Orators, but it makes the souls of Men immortal, and mortals become Gods; and transfers them from the earth, to such places whose confines are far above Olympus; therefore, O ye *Greeks*, come and be instructed; be ye as I am, for I was as you are. And these were the things which prevailed with me, the divine power and efficacy of the *Doctrine*. What was it then, I pray, that *Justin Martyr*, of a *Philosopher* becoming a *Christian*, resolved his Faith into?

Ταῦτά με ἔλε, τὸ τε τῆς παιδείας ἐνδοξόν καὶ τὸ τοῦ λόγου δυνάστην. *Id.* *ib.*

If we may believe himself, it was into the evidence of the *Doctrine* of *Christianity*, and not into the *Infallibility* of any Church. The Testimony of this person, I have the more largely insisted on, both because he was so great a *Philosopher*, as well as *Christian*, and lived so near the *Apostolical times*. Next him we produce *Athenagoras* as a *Philosopher* too, as well as *Christian*, who flourished under *Antoninus* and *Commodus*, to whom he made his *Apology* in behalf of the *Christians*, in which he first undertakes to manifest the reasonableness of the *Doctrine* which they owned, the *Foundation* of it being the same with that which the best *Philosophers* acknowledged, the existence and unity of the Deity. But (saith he) if we had nothing but such reasons as he had produced, our persuasion could only be humane; but the words of the *Prophets* are they which establish our minds.—who being carried beyond themselves, by the impulse of the *Divine Spirit*, spake that which they were moved to, when the Spirit used them as Instruments through which he spake. Is not here a plain resolution of Faith into that *Divine Authority* by which the *Prophets* spake? and that not as testified by any *Infallible Church*, but as it was discernable by those persons he spake to, for he appeals to the *Emperours* themselves concerning it; which had been a fond and absurd thing for him to do, if the knowledge of that *Divine Inspiration* did depend merely on the testimony of *Christians* as such, and were not to be discovered by some common Principles to them and others. Much to the same

Ἐπεὶ δὲ αἱ φωναὶ τῶν προφητῶν πρὸς ἡμῶν τὰς λογισμὰς. — οἱ καὶ ἐκαστὸν τῶν ἐν αὐτοῖς λογισμῶν κινήσαντες αὐτὸς τὸ θεῖον πνεῦμα, ὃ ἐνεργῶν ἐξέφωκον συγχρησάμενος τῷ πνεύματι, ὥστε καὶ ἀληθῆς αὐτὸν ἐμπνεῶσαι. *Athenag.* *Apol.* p. 9.

same purpose *Tatianus* speaks in that eloquent Oration of his against the *Greeks*, who was *Justin Martyr's* Scholar; and we shall see, how agreeable he speaks to him, in the account he gives, how he became a Christian. After (saith he) he had abundantly discovered the vanity of the Theology, and Superstitions of the *Greeks*, he fell to the reading some strange Books, much elder and more Divine than the Writings of the *Greek Philosophers*. And to these (saith he) I yielded up my Faith, for the great simplicity and plainness of the stile, and the freedom from affectation which was in the writers; and that evidence and perspicuity which was in all they writ; and because they foretold things to come, made excellent promises, and manifestly declared the Monarchy of the World. What Protestant could speak higher of the Scripture, and of those internal Arguments which are the grounds of Faith than *Tatianus* in these words doth? Yet we see, these were

καὶ μοι περὶ ταύτας συνίβη,
διὰ τὴν ἁλίστην τὸ ἄγρον καὶ τῶν
ἐπὶ τὴν ἀνεκτίχουσαν, καὶ τὴν
πύλιν ποιήσαντες τὸ ἐκκατάληπτον, καὶ
τῶν μακρῶν τὸ ἀργυρεῖον, καὶ τῶν
ἐγγεγραμμένων τὸ ἐξέλιπον, καὶ τῶν
ἄλλων τὸ μοναρχικόν *Tatianus. p.*
165.

the arguments which made him relinquish the *Greek Learning* of which he was a Professor at *Rome*, and betake himself to the profession of Christianity; though he was sure to undergo not only contempt from the World, but to be in continual hazard of his life by it. That innate simplicity of the Writings of the Scripture joyned with the perspicuity of it (if at least those words be rightly translated πᾶς ὁ κόσμος ποιήσαντες τὸ ἐκκατάληπτον by *sermo nunquam obscurus*, and it doth not rather relate to the account of the Worlds Creation, which I conjecture it may do) but however, the certainty of the predictions, the excellency of the promises, and the reasonableness of the Doctrine were the things, which by the reading of the Books he was persuaded to believe them by. But all this while we hear no news of any Churches Infallibility in order to Faith.

We come therefore to *Irenaeus*, who was *omnium doctrinarum curiosissimus explorator*, as *Tertullian* speaks of him, a great searcher into all kind of learning, and therefore surely not to seek as to the true account of his Faith. Whose judgment herein, although we have had occasion to enquire into before, yet we have Testimonies enough beside to manifest his consent with them. And although *Irenaeus* of all the ancient Fathers be looked on as the most favourable to Tradition, and is most cited to that purpose in these disputes; yet I doubt not but to make it appear, that where he speaks most concerning Tradition, he makes the resolution of Faith to be wholly and intirely into the Scripture: and they who apprehend otherwise do either take the citations out of him upon trust, or else only search him for the words of those citations, and never take the pains to enquire into the scope and design of his discourse. For clearing which, we must consider, what the subject was which he writ of, what the pleas of the adverse party were, what way *Irenaeus* takes to confute them, and to establish the Faith of Christians as to the matter which was in Controversie. The matter in dispute was this, *Valentinus* and his Scholars, not being contented with the simplicity of the Doctrine of the Gospel, and in probability the better to suit their opinions to the Heathen Mythology, and invented a strange Pedigree of Gods, the better as they pretended to give an account of the production of things, and the various dispensations which had been in the world: but knowing that the Christians did with the greatest resolution adhere to that Doctrine which was delivered by Christ and his Apostles, they could not suppose that they should embrace these figments unless

less they could some way or other *father* them upon *them*. Upon which they pretended that these very *things* which they delivered were really intended by *Christ* and the *Apostles* in their writings, but because so few were capable of them, they gave only some *intimations* of them there, but delivered these great *mysteries* privately only to those who were perfect; and that this was St. Paul's meaning when he said, *I speak wisdom among them that are perfect*. This *Irenæus* gives us an account of, in the beginning of all his discourse: but is more fully expressed in the original Greek of *Irenæus* preserved by *Epiphanius* in the heresie of the *Valentinians*. On which account alone, as *Petavius* saith, *Epiphanius* hath well deserved of *Posterity*, for preserving entire those original *Fragments* of *Irenæus*; his Greek therein being much more intelligible and smooth than the old harsh *Latin* version of him. His words are, *All which things are*

Iren. l. 1.
c. 1. p. 4.
ed. Erasmi.
Petav. not.
in Epiph.
in heres.
Valent.

Ταῦτα δὲ παρὰ τοὺς λόγους μὴ εἰρηδαί, διὰ τὸ μὴ πάντας ἰσχυεῖν τὴν γνῶσιν, μυστηριακῶς ἡμῶν τῶ Σωτῆρος διὰ παραβολῶν μυστικῶν τοῖς συνειν δυνάμενοι. Iren. apud Epiph. heres. 31. Sect. 14.

not expressly declared, in as much as all are not fit to understand them; but are mysteriously couched by our Saviour in parables, for such who are able to understand them. Thus they said, the 30. *Æones* were represented by the 30. years in which our Saviour did not appear publicly, and by the Parable of the Works in the Vineyard in which the 1, 3, 6, 9,

11 hours, making up 30. did again denote their *Æones*; and that St. Paul did most expressly signify them, when he used so often *εἰς τὰς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων*. The *Duodecad* of *Æones* by the 12 years at which our Saviour appeared disputing with the *Doctors*. The raising of *Jairus* his Daughter of 12 years, represented *Achamoth* being brought to light, whose passions were set forth by those words of our Saviour, *My God, My God, why hast thou forsaken me*, in which were three passions of *Achamoth*, Sorrow, Fear, and Despair. With many things of a like nature; but hereby we sufficiently see what their pretence was, viz. That there were deep mysteries but obscurely represented in Scripture, but whose full knowledge was delivered down by an Oral Cabala from Christ and his Apostles.

- L. 1. c. 2. Now we must consider, what course *Irenæus* takes to confute these pretensions of theirs. First he gives an account what that Faith was, which the Church dispersed up and down the World, received from the Apostles and their Disciples, viz. that thereby they believed in one God, the Father Almighty, who made Heaven and Earth, the Sea and all in them, and in one Jesus Christ the Son of God, &c. which was directly contrary to the *Valentinian Heresies*, who supposed the Supreme God and *Demiurgus* to be different, and so Christus and Salvator, and so in others. This Faith which the Church hath received, it unanimously keeps, though dispersed through the whole World; for although the Languages be different, yet the Tradition is the same among them; whether they live in Germany, France, Spain, the East, Ægypt, Libya, or elsewhere. And after in the first Book he hath shewed the many different opinions of the several broods of these Hereticks; and in the second discovered the fondness and ridiculousness of them; in his third Book, he undertakes from Scripture to shew the falseness of them. And begins with that excellent expression before cited. For we have not known the disposition (or æconomy) of our Salvation by others than by those, by whom the Gospel came to us, which they then first Preached, and after by the Will of God, delivered to us in writings to be the Foundation and Pillar of our Faith. Which being laid down by him at his entrance as the grand Principle on which he goes, will lead us to an easie understanding of all that follows. This therefore, he not only asserts, but proves. For whereas some of the Adversaries pretended that the Apostles

L. 3. c. 1.

Apostles Preached before they fully understood all they were to know, he shews how false that was, because after *Christ's Resurrection* from the Grave, they were endued with the *Spirit of God* descending from on high upon them; and were furnished with a perfect knowledge by which they went up and down Preaching the Gospel, which all and each of them had the knowledge of. Thus *Matthew* in the *Hebrew* tongue set forth his Gospel, when *Peter* and *Paul* at *Rome* Preached the Gospel and founded a Church; and after their departure *Mark*, the Disciple and Interpreter of *Peter*, writ those things which were Preached. Afterwards *John* published his Gospel at *Ephesus* in *Asia*. And all these (saith he) delivered to us one God maker of Heaven and Earth, and one Christ his Son. To whom if one doth not assent, he despiseth those who were our Lord's companions, and therefore despiseth our Lord Christ, and likewise despiseth the Father, and is condemned of himself, resisting and opposing his own Salvation which all Hereticks do.

Quibus si quis non assentit, spernit quidem participes Domini, spernit autem & ipsum Christum Dominum, spernit verò & Patrem, & est à seipso damnatus, resistens & repugnans salutis sue, quod faciunt omnes heretici. Iren. l. 3. c. 1.

Can any thing be more plain, than that *Irenæus* makes it his design to resolve Faith into the writings of Christ and his Apostles, and saith, That these writings were delivered as a Foundation of Faith that the reason why the Christians believed but one God and one Christ, was, because they read of no more in the Gospels publish'd by them, That he that despiseth them who were our Lord's companions, despise himself and God, and condemn themselves. He doth not say, he that despiseth the lawfully sent Pastors of the Church meeting in General Councils, nor them who have power to oblige the Church to believe as well as the Apostles had, as you say, but evidently makes the obligation to believe, to depend upon that revelation of God's will, which was made by the Apostles, and is by their writings conveyed down to us. Would not the *Valentinians* have thought themselves presently run down by such ways of confutation as yours are, that they must believe the present Church Infallible in whatever is delivered to be believed to the world?

But doth not *Irenæus* himself make use of the Churches Tradition as the great argument to confute them by? I grant he doth so, and it is on that very account that he might confute them, and not lay down the only sure Foundation of Christian Faith. For he gives that reason of his doing so in the beginning of the very next Chapter. For, (saith he) when we dispute against them out of the Scripture, they are turned presently to an accusing of the Scriptures as though they were not in all things right, and wanted Authority, and because of their ambiguity, and for that truth cannot be found out by them without the help of Tradition. I need

Cum enim ex Scripturis arguuntur, in accusationem convertuntur ipsarum Scripturarum, quasi non rectè habeant, neque sint ex auctoritate, & quia variè sint dicta, & quia non possit ex his inveniri veritas ab his qui nesciant traditionem. Iren. l. 3. c. 2.

not say, that *Irenæus* prophesied of you in this saying of his, but it is as true of you as if he had. Your pretences being the very same against the Scriptures being the rule of Faith, with those of the *Valentinians*; only that you deny not the truth of what is therein contained, for otherwise the want of Authority in themselves, the ambiguity of them, the impossibility of knowing the sense of them without Tradition, are the very same arguments which with the greatest Pomp and Ostentation are produced by you against the Scriptures being the Rule whereby to judge of Controversies. Which we have no more cause to wonder at, than *Irenæus* had in the *Valentinians*, because from them we produce our greatest Arguments against your fond Opinions. Now when the *Valentinians* pretended their great rule was on oral Tradition, which was conveyed from the Apostles down to them; to this *Irenæus* opposeth the constant Tradition of the Apostolical Churches, which in a

continued

continued succession was preserved from the *Apostles times*, which was the same every where among all the *Churches*, which every one who desired it, might easily be satisfied about; because *they could number them,*

Et habemus annumerare eos, qui ab Apostolis instituti sunt Episcopi in Ecclesia & successores eorum usque ad nos, qui nihil tale docuerunt, neque cognoverunt, quale ab his deliratur. L. 3. c. 3.

who by the Apostles were appointed Bishops in Churches, and their successors; unto our own times, who taught no such thing, nor ever knew any such thing as they madly fancy to themselves. We see then his appeal to Tradition was only in a matter of fact, Whether ever any such

thing as their opinion which was not contained in *Scripture*, was delivered to them, by the *Apostles* or no, *i.e.* Whether the *Apostles* left any *oral Traditions* in the *Churches* which should be the rule to interpret *Scriptures* by, or no? And the whole design of *Irenaeus* is to prove the contrary, by an appeal to all the *Apostolical Churches*, and particularly by appealing to the *Roman Church*, because of its due fame and celebrity in that Age wherein *Irenaeus* lived. So that *Irenaeus* appealed to the then *Roman Church*, even when he speaks highest in the honour of it, for somewhat which is fundamentally contrary to the *pretensions* of the new *Roman Church*. He then appealed to it, for an evidence against such *oral Traditions* which were pretended to be left by the *Apostles* as a rule to understand *Scripture* by; and, were it not for this same pretence now, what will become of the Authority of the present *Roman Church*?

After he hath thus manifested by recourse to the *Apostolical Churches* that there was no such *Tradition* left among them, it was very reasonable to infer that there was *none such at all*; for they could not imagine, if the *Apostles* had designed any such *Tradition*, but they would have communicated it to those famous *Churches* which were planted by them, and it was absurd to suppose that those *Churches* who could so easily derive their succession from the *Apostles* should in so short a time have lost the memory of so rich a treasure deposited with them, as that was pretended to be; from whence he sufficiently refutes that unreasonable imagination of the *Valentinians*. Which having done, he proceeds to settle those firm grounds on which the *Christians* believed in *one God the Father*, and in *one Lord Jesus Christ*, which he doth by removing the only *Objection* which the *Adversaries* had against them. For when the *Christians* declared, the main reason into which they resolved their Faith as to the Principles, was, *Because no other God or Christ were revealed in Scripture*, but them whom they believed, the *Valentinians* answered, this could not be a sufficient foundation for their Faith on this account, because many things were delivered in *Scripture*, not according to the truth of the things, but the judgment and opinion of the Persons they were spoken to. This therefore being such a pretence as would destroy any firm resolution of Faith into *Scripture*, and must necessarily place it in *Tradition*; *Irenaeus* concerns himself much to demonstrate the contrary, by an *Ostension* (as he calls it) that *Christ and the Apostles did all along speak according to truth, and not according to the opinion of their Auditors*, which is the entire subject of the fifth Chapter of his third Book. Which he proves first of *Christ*, because he was *Truth it self*, and it would be very contrary to his nature to speak of things otherwise than they were, when the very design of his coming was to direct Men in the way of *Truth*. The *Apostles* were Persons who professed to declare *truth* to the World, and as light cannot communicate with *darkness*, so neither could *truth* be blinded with so much *falsehood* as that opinion supposeth in them. And therefore neither our Lord nor his *Apostles* could be supposed to mean any other God or *Christ* than whom they declared. For this (saith he) were rather to increase their ignorance and confirm them

them in it, than to cure them of it; and therefore that Law was true which pronounced a curse on every one who led a blind Man out of his way. And the Apostles being sent for the recovery of the lost sight of the blind, cannot be supposed to speak to Men according to their present opinion, but according to the manifestation of truth. For, what Physician intending to cure a Patient, will do according to his Patients desire, and not rather what will be best for him? From whence he concludes, Since the design of Christ and his Apostles was not to flatter but to cure Mens souls; it follows, that they did not speak to them, according to their former opinion, but according to truth without all hypocrisie and dissimulation. From whence it follows, that if Christ and his Apostles did speak according to truth, there is then need of no Oral Tradition for our understanding Scripture, and consequently the resolution of our Faith as to God and Christ, and proportionably as to other objects to be believed, is not into any Tradition pretending to be derived from the Apostles, but into the Scriptures themselves; which by this discourse evidently appears to have been the judgement of Irenæus.

The next which follows, is Clemens of Alexandria who flourished A. D. 196. whom St. Hierom accounted the most learned of all the writers of the Church: and therefore cannot be supposed ignorant in so necessary a part of the Christian Doctrine as the Resolution of Faith is. And if his judgement may be taken, the Scriptures are the only certain Foundation of Faith; for in his Admonition to the Gentiles after he hath with a great deal of excellent learning derided the Heathen Superstitions, when he comes to give an account of the Christian Faith, he begins it with this pregnant Testimony to our purpose. For (saith he) the Sacred Oracles affording us the most manifest grounds of Divine worship, are the Foundation of Truth. And so goes on in a high commendation of the Scripture, as the most compendious directions for happiness, the best Institution for government of life, the most free from all vain ornaments, that they, raise Mens souls up out of wickedness, yielding the most excellent remedies, dissuading from the greatest deceit, and most clearly incouraging to a foreseen happiness; with more of the same nature. And when after he perswades Men with so much Rhetorick and earnestness to imbrace the Scriptures ἀναπαραλαβάναι ταῖς ἀκούαις with the greatest readiness, he gives this as the reason of it, that so they might ἐν ἀγνῶναις ἐνοδοῦν ταῖς ψυχαῖς ἢ θεόν, entertain God in chaste souls. For the Word is that light to Men, by which we see God: and soon after speaking that the design of Religion is to make Men like to God as much as possible, he adds, That truly they are the Sacred Scriptures which make Men Holy and Deifie Men, i. e. by Assimilation. And in that large and eloquent Parenæsis which follows, wherein he perswades Men to the forsaking their old customs and embracing Christianity, all the arguments he useth are drawn from the Scriptures, and not so much as the least mention of any Infallible Ensurer of their truth and authority, but supposeth the evidence he produceth, sufficient to perswade them to the belief and love of them. In the first of his Stromata, he proves the truth of the Scriptures by the much greater antiquity of them than any of the Greek learning. In the second, where he particularly enquires into the nature and ground of Faith, he hath this

Καὶ ὅι χειρομοῖ, τὰς εἰς τὴν θεοσέ-
κειαν ἡμῶν ἀφορμαὶς ἀναγνώσασα περ-
λεῖοντες, διμελεῖται τὴν ἀλήθειαν.
Clem. Alex. περὶ ἐκτ. q. 50. ed.
Parif.

ὥς ὃ ὁ λόγος ἀνθρώποις, δι' ἃ κα-
ταναζόμεθα ἢ θεόν. p. 55.

Ἰεσοῦ ὃς ὡς ἀληθῶς, τὰ ἱεροποιῦντα αὐ-
θεοποιῦντα γραμμάτια. p. 56.

Ὁ πνεύματος τῶν τῶν γεγραμμένων τῶν
θείων, τὸν ἄριστον βασιλεὺς ἔχον, ἀν-
δείξιν ἀναστήσαν, τὸν οὖν τὸν γε-
γραμμένον παρὰ λαμβάνει δεικ.
Strom. 2. p. 362.

this expression, *He therefore that believes the Sacred Scriptures, having a firm judgement doth receive the voice of God who gave the Scriptures, as an impregnable demonstration.* (Although the text be commonly Printed without the comma between *ἔχον* and *ἀνδείξιν*, yet the sense and context makes it evident that it ought to be there, and accordingly *Sylburgius* gives intimation of it in his notes, and *Gentian Hervet* in the translation as revised by *Heinsius* applies the demonstration to what follows, but very weakly joyns ἀναστήσαν with *ἔχον* and not with *ἀνδείξιν*, and so renders it *firmum habens judicium cui contradicere nequit*, whereas it is plain that he intends to give an account what that foundation is, which *Faith* doth stand on.) And after having made a large discourse concerning the nature of *Faith* comparing the judgement of *Philosophers* concerning it, he concludes

Τὸς δὲ τὴν ἀληθείαν φιλοθεάμενας, ἀ-
πείν ἐπιχειρήσας ἀξιόπιστον διδασκα-
λῶν πρὸς μόνον Σωτῆρι Θεῷ, βασιλεὺς
τῶν λεγόμενων ἀπαίσειν παρ' αὐτοῦ.
p. 369.

with this saying, *That it is an absurd thing for the followers of Pythagoras to suppose that his ipse dixit, was instead of a demonstration to them; and yet those who are the lovers of truth not to believe the sure testimony of our only Saviour and God, but to exact proofs of him of what he spake.* Wherein he discovers

that *Christianity* required from Men no unreasonable thing in expecting assent where no such kind of proofs as those used by *Philosophers* are; but if the *Epicureans* did suppose some kind of anticipation necessary to knowledge, if the *Pythagoreans* relied on Authority, if *Heraclitus* quarrell'd with such as could neither hear nor speak, i. e. such as neither had Authority themselves, and yet would rely on none; it could not be judged any absurd thing that *Christianity* did require such an assent to what *Christ* delivered, especially considering that he was

Γίνεσθαι τοίνυν αὐτῇ ἡ πίστις ἀπόδειξις
βεβαία, ἐπεὶ τοῖς ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ
δοθέντων ἡ ἀλήθεια ἐπέσται. Strom. 6.
p. 649.

ἀξιόπιστος, i. e. that he discovered sufficient reason why he was to be believed in whatever he spake. And thence elsewhere he says, *That Faith is a sure demonstration, because truth follows whatever is delivered from God.* And when he gives an

account what that true knowledge is which the *Christian* hath, he shews what things are requisite to it; two things Knowledge supposeth ζήτησις and ἐνρεσις, enquiry and discovery; the Enquiry (saith he) is an impulse of the mind for the finding out of something by some signs which are proper to it; Discovery, is the end and rest of enquiry, which

Τῆς τοίνυν αὐτῇ Θεῷ ζήτησις, ἀρεσις
μὲν, ἡ διὰ τῶν οὐκ ἐκ διδασκαλίας σημεῖον
δὲ τῶν ἐκ τῆς Σωτηρίας ἡμετέρας αὐτῶν ἐκείνων
τῶν οὐκ ἐκ Θεοῦ, αὐτῶν τε προσηγμένων τῶν
παρὰ αὐτοῦ προσηγμένων, τῶν τε καὶ
ἐκ τῆς συνπαρέστασις τῇ
Χριστοῦ αὐτοῦ τῇ αἰδήσει αὐτοῦ μαρ-
τυρίαι· οὗτοι δὲ καὶ μετὰ τὴν ἀνάληψιν
κηρυσσόμεναί τε καὶ ἐμφανῶς δεικνύ-
μεναί δυνάμεις αὐτοῦ τεκμήριον ἀεὶ
τῶν παρ' ἡμῶν ἐκ τῶν ἀληθειῶν, τὸ αὐ-
τὸν διδάσκειν τὸν οὐκ ἐκ Θεοῦ. Strom.
6. 674.

lies in the comprehension of the thing, which is properly Knowledge. Now the signs by which things are discovered, are either precedent, concomitant, or subsequent, All these he thus applies to the Scriptures. The discovery, as the end of our enquiry after God, is, the Doctrine delivered by his Son; but the signs whereby we know that he was the Son of God, precedent, are the Prophecies declaring his coming; concomitant, were the Testimonies concerning his birth: subsequent, are those Miracles, which were published, and manifestly shewed to the world after his Ascension. Therefore the peculiar evidence that the truth is with us, is, that the Son of God himself hath taught us. A place

place not so clear in it self, as miserably involved through the oscitancy of the *Latin Interpreter*, in which it is plain, that *Clemens* doth exactly, according to all rational principles of knowledge, give an account of the grounds of *Christian Faith*; the main principle of which, is, the doctrine delivered by *Christ*; which, that it ought to be assented to, appears by a full concurrence of all those signs which are necessary in enquiries; here are the greatest precedent signs (*Prophecies*, made so long before, exactly accomplished in him) the fullest concomitant signs (in the many wonderful things which happened at his coming into the world) and the clearest subsequent signs by those great and uncontroled miracles, which were wrought in the world after his *Ascension*; all which put together do evidently prove that he was the Son of God who delivered this doctrine to us, and therefore deserves our most firm assent in whatever appears to be his Word. Can any thing then be more apparent than his resolution of Faith into the rational evidence of *Christ's* being the Son of God, which is manifested to us not by the *Infallible testimony* of any Church, but by the *Infallible signs* of it which were precedent to, attendant on, and consequent to his appearance in the world. If therefore (saith he)

according to *Plato*, truth can only be learned, either from God, or those who are come from him, we may justly boast that we learn the truth from the Son of God, taking the Testimonies out of those Sacred Oracles, which were first *Prophecied* and then fully declared, viz. by accomplishment. The main ground of Faith then, is such as the wisest *Philosophers* did admit of, viz. that whatsoever God said is true, and none can deliver truth but such

as come from him, on which account there is nothing left, but evidence that he in whom we believe was the Son of God, which is abundantly manifested by the accomplishment of those *Prophecies* in him which were made so long before. After which he

disputes against the same sort of *Hereticks* which *Irenæus* did, and up- P. 676, on the same principles, viz. that whatever God or *Christ* thought necessary for 678. &c.

us to know or believe, is consigned to us in the writings of the *Prophets* and *Apostles*; and thence he cites that out of *Peters* κήρυγμα (a Book I suppose then extant under that name) ἐν ᾧ οὐ γράφεται nothing without the written word, where was the unwritten word then? And in that end of the Book discovers the weakness of *Philosophy*, because it came from

meer Men; but Men, as Men, are no sufficient teachers when they speak concerning God. For (saith he)

Man cannot speak ἀξιοχρίως things becoming God; for being weak and mortal he cannot speak as

he ought of a being infinite and immortal, nor he

that is the work of him who made it; besides he that cannot speak truth concerning Himself, how much less is he to be believed concerning God? For

as much as Man wants of Divine power, so much must his speech fall short of God, when he discourseth of him. For

Man's speech is naturally weak and unable to express God; not only as to his essence, but as to his power

and works; thence he concludes a necessity that God by his Spirit must discover himself to Men, which revelation he proves

to be only extant among Christians, because of the many Divine Te-

M m

stimonies

Εἴπερ ἐν τῇ κατὰ Πλάτωνα, ἢ παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ, ἢ παρὰ τῶν ἐκ γένων τοῦ θεοῦ, τὸ ἀληθὲς ἐκμανθάνειν μόνως, οἱ τε εἰκότως παρὰ τῶν θείων λογίων τὰ μαρτύρια ἐκλεγόμενοι, ἢ ἀλλήθεν ἀνὴρ ἐκδοσκέδαι, διὰ τὸ ὅτι τὸ θεοῦ περὶ τῶν ἀδελφῶν μὴ τὸ πρῶτον, ἔπειτα δὲ καὶ σαφανιστέον. P. 675.

Ἀλλ' ἐκ ἐχέγυθου διδασκαλία καὶ θεοῦ λέγοντες ἄνθρωποι, κατὰ ἀνθρώπου. P. 697.

Ἀδελφὸς γὰρ φύσει ὁ ἀνθρώπινος λόγος, καὶ ἀδύνατος φερεται θεόν. Id. ib.

testimonies that Christ was the Son of God, because the knowledge that came by him was so remarkably dispersed abroad in the world, and did prevail, notwithstanding all opposition and persecution. For (saith he) the Greek Philosophy if any ordinary Magistrate forbid it did presently sink; but our doctrine hath been forbid from its first publishing, by the Kings and Potentates of the earth, who have used their utmost industry to destroy both us and that together, but still it flourisheth,

Ἡ δὲ καὶ μᾶλλον ἀνθεῖ· ὡς ἀν-
θρώπινη ἀποδίδωκε διδασκαλία, ἢ
ὡς ἀδυνάτου μαρτυρεῖται σωρεῖα. p.
689.

and the more for its being persecuted; for it dies not like a humane doctrine, nor perisbeth like a weak gift. Thus we see that he insists on rational evidence as the great and sufficient testimony into which our Faith is resolved as to the being

of a Divine Revelation. In his next Book he answers some objections of the Heathens against believing Christianity, of which the chiefest was, the dissent among the Christians, wherein (if ever) he had an opportunity to declare what the certain rule of Faith is, and what power God hath left his Church for determining matters to be believed by us. But for want of understanding this necessary foundation of Faith, viz. the Churches Infallibility, he is fain to answer this objecti-

P. 753, &c. on just as a Protestant would do. 1. If this were an argument against truth, the objectors had none themselves, for both Jews and Greeks had heresies among them. 2. The very coming of heresies was an argument of the truth of Scripture, because that had expressly foretold them. 3. This argument doth not hold any where else, therefore it should not in reason here, viz. where there is any dissent there can be no certainty; for though Physicians differ much from one another, yet Patients are not thereby discouraged from seeking to them for cure. 4. This should only make Men use more care and diligence in the search and enquiry after truth; for they will find abundant recompence for their search in the pleasure of finding truth. Would any one say, because two apples are offered to him, the one a real fruit, the other made of wax, that therefore he will meddle with neither; but rather that he ought to use more care to distinguish the one from the other? If there be but one highway and many by paths which lead to precipices, rivers, or the Sea, Will he not go in the highway because there are such false ones? but rather go in it with the more care, and get the exactest knowledge of it he can. Doth a Gardener cast off the care of his Garden because weeds grow up with his herbs? or rather, doth he not use the more diligence to distinguish one from the other? So ought we to do in discerning truth. 5. That all those who seriously enquire after truth may receive satisfaction. For either Mans mind is capable of evidence, or it is not; if not, it is to no purpose to trouble our selves with any thing of knowledge at all; if it be, then we

Ἀποδείξεως δὲ ἔστι ἀνάγκη συγ-
καταβαίνειν εἰς τὰς ζητήσεις, καὶ
δὲ αὐτῶν τῶν γραφῶν ἐκμαντά-
νειν ἀποδεικτικῶς, ὅπως μὴ ἀ-
ποσφάλλουσιν αἱ αἰρέσεις, &c. p.
755.

must descend to particular questions, by which we may demonstratively learn from the Scriptures how the heresies fell off from them; and that the most exact knowledge is preserved in truth alone, and the ancient Church. If then Heresies must be demonstra-

tively confuted out of Scriptures, what then doth he make to be the rule to judge of Controversies, but only them? For what he speaks of the ancient Church, he speaks of it as in conjunction with truth, and in opposition to those novel Heresies of the Basilidians and Valentinians.

For

For, that he doth not at all appeal to the judgement of any Church much less the present, as having any infallibility whereon Men ought to rely in matters of Faith, appears likewise by his following words.

But those (saith he) who are willing to imploy themselves in the most excellent things, will never give over the search of truth, till they have received a demonstration of it from the Scriptures themselves.

Here we see, the last resolution of assent, is into the Scriptures themselves, without any the least mention or intimation of any Infallibility in the Church, either to deliver, or interpret those Scriptures to us: And after, gives the true account of Heresies, viz. Mens not adhering to the Scriptures. For

(saith he) they must necessarily be deceived in the greatest things who undertake them, unless they hold fast the Rule of Truth, which they received from Truth it self. And in this following discourse he goes as high as any Protestants whatever (even

such who suppose the Scripture to be principium indemonstrabile, by any thing but it self) for he

delivered by Christ, to be the Principle of our Faith, and we make use of it (saith he) to be our κριτήριον to find out other things by. But,

whatever is judged, is not believed till it be judged, therefore that can be no Principle which stands in need of being judged. Justly therefore when we have by Faith received that indemonstrable Principle, and from the Principle it self used demonstra-

tions concerning it self, we are by the voice of our Lord instructed in the knowledge of Truth.

Nothing can be more plain in what he saith, than that, if there were a higher κριτήριον than

Scripture, (as there must be, if we are to receive it on the account of the Churches Infallible Testimony) the Scripture could not be called the Principle of our Faith, but when we receive the Scripture, the evidence we have that it is our Principle must be

fetch'd from it self; and therefore he does here in terms (as express as may be) resolve the belief of Scripture into internal arguments, and makes it as much a Principle supposed as ever his Lordship doth. And immediately after, when he proposeth that very Question, How this should be

proved to others, We expect not (saith he) any proof from Men, but we prove the thing sought for by the Word of God, which is more worthy belief than any demonstration, or rather which is the only demonstration, by the knowledge of which, those who have tasted of the

Scripture alone become believers. Can any one who reads these words ever imagine, that this Man speaks like one, that said, That the Scriptures of themselves appear no more to be

God's Word, than distinction of colours to a blind Man? How much beyond the Valentinians and Basilidians would Clemens have accounted so great a madness? who so plainly asserts the Scriptures to be proved by themselves, and that not casually, or in the heat of argument; But lest we should not thoroughly apprehend his meaning repeats it again in the same page,

αὐτὸν αὐτῶν τῶν γραφῶν τελείως ἀποδεικνύντες, perfectly demonstrating the

Id. ib. Ἀλλ' οἱ πονεῖν ἔτοιμοι ἐπὶ τοῖς καλλίστοις, ἢ περὶ τῶν ἀποδείξεων ζητεῖν ἐς τὴν ἀλήθειαν πρὶν αὖ τὴν ἀπόδειξιν ἀπὸ τῶν λαβῶσι τῶν γραφῶν. Id. ib.

Σφαλλόμενοι δὲ ἀνάγκη μίγναι τῆς μαγίστης ἐσχευῆς πέφυκασιν, ἢν μὴ ἔκαστος τῆς ἀληθείας παρ' αὐτῆς λαβόντες ἔχουσι τῆς ἀληθείας. Id. p. 756.

Τὸ κριόμενον δὲ πᾶν ἐστὶ ἀπὸ τῶν πρὶν κριθῆναι ὥστ' ἐὰν ἀρχὴ τὸ κείμενον δεόμενον· εἰκότως τοίνυν πίσει περὶ ἀλλήλους ἀναπόδεικτον τὴν ἀρχὴν ἐκ ἀερισίας, καὶ τὰς ἀποδείξεις παρ' αὐτῆς τῆς ἀρχῆς περὶ τῆς ἀρχῆς λαβόντες, φωνῇ Κυρίου παιδευόμεθα πρὸς τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν τῆς ἀληθείας. Strom. 7. p. 757.

Οὐ τὴν ἐξ ἀνθρώπων ἀναμένομεν μαρτυρίαν, ἀλλὰ τῇ τῇ Κυρίου φωνῇ πισύμεθα τὸ ζητούμενον· ἢ πασῶν ἀποδείξεων ἐχρηστούμεθα, μάλλον δὲ, ἢ μόνῃ ἀπόδειξις ἕσα τυγχάνει· καθ' ἣν ἐπισήμην οἱ μὲν ἀπογευσάμενοι μόνον τῶν γραφῶν, πιστοί. Ibid.

Scriptures by themselves. And are not all these Testimonies of such Persons so near the *Apostolical times*, sufficient to acquaint us what the grounds of the *Resolution of Faith* were in the *Christian Church*? When all of them do so unanimously fix on the *Scripture*, and not so much as mention the *Infallible Testimonies* of any *Church*, much less the *Roman*. Much more might be cited out of this excellent *Author* to the same purpose, particularly where he refutes the *Valentinians*, who deserted the *Scriptures*, and pleaded *Tradition*: But the Testimonies already produced are so plain, that it will be to no purpose to produce any more.

§. 7.

It were easie to continue an account of the same grounds of Faith, through the succeeding *Writers* of the *Christian Church*, who have designedly writ on that Subject, in vindication of *Christian Religion*, which they unanimously prove to be *Divine*, chiefly by these *Arguments*; from the undoubted *Miracles* which were wrought by *Christ*, and his *Apostles*, from the exact fulfilling of *Prophecies*, and the admirable *Propagation* of the *Christian Doctrine*; all which are particularly insisted on by *Origen* against *Celsus*; by *Tertullian*, in his *Apologetick, adversus Scapulam*, and elsewhere; by *Minutius Felix*, *Arnobius*, and *Lactantius*; not to mention *Ensebins* in his *Books* of preparation and demonstration *Evangelical*; *Cyril's* Answer to *Julian* and others. (But, having elsewhere more fully and largely considered that subject, I rather chuse to refer the Reader to what hath been there handled already, than to tire his patience with either repeating the same, or adding more Testimonies to the same purpose.) Only that which is most pertinent to our present purpose, I shall here add, Whether it is credible that those persons who fully understood the *Doctrine of Christianity*, who were themselves rational and inquisitive Men, and writ for the satisfaction not only of subtle adversaries, but of doubting and staggering Christians, should so unanimously agree in insisting on the evidence of matter of fact, for the truth of the thing delivered in *Scripture*, and the fore-mentioned *Arguments* for the *Divinity* of the *Doctrine* therein delivered, had it not been the judgment of the *Church* they lived in, that the resolution of Faith was into those grounds on which they insisted? And is it again credible, that any of them should believe the *Testimony* of the *Church* to be necessary as *infallible*, in order to a *Divine Faith*, and that without it, the *Scriptures* could not be believed as *Divine*, and yet in all their disputes with the *Gentiles* concerning the *Doctrine of Christianity*, and with several *Hereticks* (as the *Marcionists*, &c.) concerning the *Books* of *Scripture*, upon no occasion should mention this grand *Palladium* of Faith, viz. the *Infallibility* of the present *Church*? And lastly, Is it credible, that when in our modern *Controversies* Men do evidently maintain faction and interest, more than the common Principles of *Christianity* (that he must be blinder than one that can see no distinction of colours, that doth not discern on what account this *Infallibility* is now pretended.) Is it, I say, credible, that a *Doctrine* pretended so necessary for our believing *Scriptures* with *Divine Faith*, should be so concealed; when it ought, for the honour and interest of *Christianity*, to have been most divulged? Which now only in these last and worst times is challenged by an usurping party in the *Church* as left by *Christ* himself (when no other evidence can be given of it, but what was common to all ages of the *Church*) as belonging to such a party under the pretence of the *Catholick Church*, which doth so apparently use it only to uphold her pretended *Authority*, and so makes it serve to the worst ends, and the most unworthy designs.

Having thus far considered what the judgment of those *Fathers* was concerning the resolution of Faith, who lived nearest the *Apostolical times*;

I should

Origines
sacr. l. 2.
c. 7, 8, 9,
10.

I should now come to consider what you can produce out of *Antiquity*, for your *Churches Infallibility*, or more generally, for any *infallible Testimony* supposed in the *Catholick Church* (whatever that be) in order to a Foundation for *Divine Faith*: But you very prudently avoid the *Testimonies* of *Antiquity* in so necessary a subject as this is; for, those *Testimonies* mentioned in the foregoing Chapter, in explication of *Matth. 28. 20.* taking them, as you have in so loose and careless a manner produced them, make nothing at all for the *Churches Infallible Testimony*; but only assert that which is not denied, that there shall always be a *Christian Church* in the world. Our only remaining task then, as to this, is, to examine in what way you seek to enervate the *Testimonies* produced by his Lordship out of *Antiquity*, which you do in the latter part of Chap. 8. His Lordship had truly said, *That this method and manner of proving the Scripture to be the Word of God, which he useth, is the same which the ancient Church ever held, namely Tradition, or Ecclesiastical Authority first, and then all other arguments, but especially internal from the Scripture it self.* For which he cites, first, *The Church in S. Augustine's time.* He was no enemy to Church-Tradition (saith his Lordship) yet when he would prove that the Author of the Scripture (and so of the whole knowledge of Divinity, as it is supernatural) is God in Christ, he takes this as the all-sufficient way, and gives four proofs all internal to the Scripture. 1. the Miracles. 2. That there is nothing carnal in the Doctrine. 3. That there hath been such performance of it. 4. That by such a Doctrine of Humility, the whole world almost hath been converted. And whereas *ad muniendam fidem*, for the defending of the Faith, and keeping it entire, there are two things requisite, Scripture and Church-Tradition; Vincent. Lirinens. places authority of Scriptures first, and then Tradition. And since it is apparent, that Tradition is first in order of time, it must necessarily follow, that Scripture is first in order of nature, that is the chief upon which Faith rests and resolves it self. To this (after you have needlessly explained his Lordships opinion in this Controversie) you begin to answer thus; He cites first Vincentius Lirinensis, l. 1. c. 1. who makes our Faith to be confirmed both by Scripture and Tradition of the Catholick Church. But, Are not you like to be trusted in citing Fathers who doubly falsifie a Testimony of your adversaries, when you may be so easily disproved? For 1. You tell us, he cites that first, which he produceth last. 2. You cite that as produced by him for the Foundation of Faith, which he expressly cites for the preservation of the Doctrine of Faith; so he tells you *ad muniendam fidem*, &c. Can any thing be more plain and obvious to any one who looks into that discourse of Vincentius, than that he makes it not his business to give an account of the general Foundations of Faith as to the Scriptures being Gods Word, but of the particular Doctrines of Faith, in opposition to the Heresies which arise in the Church. So that all that he speaks concerning Scripture, is not about the authority, but the sense and interpretation of it. If therefore I should grant you, that he speaks of Christian and Divine Faith, What is this to your purpose, unless you could prove that he speaks of that Divine Faith, whereby we believe the Scripture to be the Word of God. But yet your argument is very good to prove, that he speaks not of any humane fallible persuasion, but true Christian Divine Faith; for he opposes it to Heresie, and calls it sound Faith, and his Faith. It seems then, whatever Faith is sound for the matter of it, is presently Christian, Divine and Infallible; and so, whosoever believes any thing which is materially true, in opposition to Heresies, needs never fear as long as he doth so, for according to you he hath

hath *Christian and Infallible Faith*; but what if the *Devils Faith* be as sound as any *Catholick's*, Must it therefore be *Divine Faith*? No (it may be you will answer) because he wants the formal object of Faith; and doth not believe on the account of your Churches Infallibility; I verily believe you; for he knows the *jugglings* of it too much to believe it *infallible*. But, take *Vincentius* in what sense you please, that is evident in him which his Lordship produced him for, that, for the preserving Faith entire, he places authority of *Scripture* first, and then *Tradition* (unless you will serve his Testimony, as you do his Lordships, because it makes for your purpose, say, He mentions *Tradition* first, and then *Scripture*) but, say you, He says *Tradition* doth as truly confirm *Divine Faith*, as *Scripture*, though *Scripture* doth it in a higher manner. If you did but consider, either what kind of *Tradition*, or what kind of *Faith Vincentius* insists on, you could not possibly think his words any thing to your purpose. For he speaks not of any *Tradition Infallibly attested* to us, without which you pretend there can be no *Divine Faith*, but of such an *Universal Tradition* which depends wholly upon *Antiquity*, *Universality*, and *Consent*, and never so much as mentions, much less pretends to any thing of *Infallibility*: So that if you grant such a kind of *Tradition*, doth as truly confirm *Faith* as the *Scripture*, then you must grant no necessity of an *Infallible Testimony* to assure us of that *Tradition*, for *Vincentius* speaks of such a kind of *Tradition*, as hath no connexion with *Infallibility*. For if *Vincentius* had ever in the least thought of any such thing, so great and zealous an opposer of *Heresies* would not have left out that which had been more to his purpose, than all that he had said. For wise Men, who have thoroughly considered of *Vincentius* his way, though in general they cannot but approve of it so far as to think it highly improbable, that there should be *Antiquity*, *Universality*, and *Consent* against the true and genuine sense of *Scripture*, yet when they consider this way of *Vincentius*, with all those *cautions*, *restrictions*: and *limitations* set down by him (l. i. c. 39.) they are apt to think, that he hath put Men to a *wild-goose-chase* to find out any thing according to his Rules; and that *S. Augustine* spake a great deal more to the purpose,

Alios autem ita lego, ut quantalibet sanctitate, doctrinâ q; præpollent, non ideo verum putem, quia ipsi ita senserunt, sed quia mihi, vel per illos auctores Canonicos, vel probabili ratione, quod à vero non abhorreat, persuadere potuerunt. August. ep. 19.

when he spake concerning all the *Writers of the Church*; That although they had never so much learning and sanctity, he did not think it true, because they thought so, but because they persuaded him to believe it true, either from the Authority of *Scripture*, or some probable Reason. If therefore *S. Austin's* Authority be

not sunk so low as that of the *Monk of Lerins*, we have very little reason to think that *Tradition* can as truly confirm Faith to us as the *Scriptures*, supposing that to have been the meaning of *Vincentius*. Which yet is not reasonable to imagine, since *Vincentius* himself grants, that in case of *inveterate Heresie* or *Schism*, either the sole Authority of *Scripture* is to be used, or at most the determinations of *General Councils*; nay, and in all cases

Lib. i. c. 39.

Quum sit perfectus Scripturarum Canon, sibiq; ad omnia satis superq; sufficiat, &c. l. i. c. 2.

doth suppose, that the *Canon of Scripture* is perfect, and is abundantly sufficient of it self for all things. Can you yet therefore suppose, that *Vincentius* did think that *Tradition* did as truly confirm our Faith as

the *Scripture*? Which is your assertion, and the only thing whereby you pretend that the *Bishop* hath misconstrued *Vincentius*; but whether be more guilty of it, I leave to impartial judgement.

S. 9.

The next Testimony you consider, is, that of *Henricus à Gandavo*. For his Lordship had said, That the *School* had confessed, this was the way ever. For

which

which he cites the Testimony of that Schoolman, *That daily with them that are without, Christ enters by the woman i. e. the Church, and they believe by that same which she gives* (alluding to the story of the woman of Samaria.)

But when they come to hear Christ himself, they believe His words before the words of the woman: For when they have once found Christ, they do more believe his words in Scripture, than they do the Church, which testifies of him; because then propter illam, for the Scripture they believe the Church. And if the Church should speak contrary to the Scripture, they would not believe it. Thus (saith his Lordship) the School taught them.

No, that did it not (say you.) But let us see, how rarely you prove it: For (you say) he speaks all this of a supernatural and Divine Faith to be given, both to the Scriptures, and the Church. Gandavensis certainly is much obliged to you, who venture to speak such great Absurdities for his sake; for if he be understood in both places of Divine and Infallible Faith, these rare consequences follow. 1. That the first beginning of Faith is equal to the highest degree of it; for when he speaks of the Church, he speaks of Christ's entering by that, which can be meant of nothing else but the first step to Faith, as is plain in the parallel case of the Woman of Samaria; but if this were Divine and Infallible, it must be equal to the highest degree, for that I suppose can be but Divine and Infallible, unless you can find out degrees in Infallibility. By this Rule, you make him that is but over the threshold as much in the house, as he that is sate down to the Table; a plant at its first peeping out of the earth, to be as tall as at its full growth; and the Samaritans as firmly to believe in Christ at the first mention of him by the Woman, as when they saw and heard him. 2. By this you make an Infallible Faith to be built on a Fallible Testimony; for to what purpose else was the Similitude of the Woman of Samaria insisted on, but to parallel the Testimony of the Church with that of the Woman, and consequently the Faith built on the Churches Testimony to be like that which the Samaritans had of Christ upon the Womans Testimony; and if you believe that Faith Infallible, you must assert, an Infallible Faith to be built on a fallible Testimony, and yet to be as infallible, as that which is built on an Infallible Testimony. And then, I pray, tell me, To what end would you make your Churches Testimony Infallible, if Faith may be infallible without it?

But, it may be, though these seem hard things, yet you prove them invincibly: No doubt of it; for, you say, *That Christ enters by that Faith, but Christ cannot enter into a soul by a meer humane fallible perswasion, but by Divine Faith only.* Nay, when he says, *That he more believes the Scripture, than the Churches Testimony, he saith, That he believes the Church; But how can he believe without Faith?* O the irresistible force of demonstrations! But what silly people are we, that thought a Man might enter into a house by the door, tho' he met not with his hearty entertainment till afterwards? But, Do you really think, that Christ never enters into a soul, but by Divine and Infallible Faith? For Christ enters by that which gives him his first admission, but his full reception must be by a higher degree of Faith. Do you think Men believe as much at first as ever after? If not, May not Christ be said to enter by that lower degree of Faith? I pray, What think you of the case in hand, Did not the belief of Christ enter by the Woman of Samaria? and was that, as Divine a Faith, as what they had afterwards? Nay, take Christs entering (as improperly as you can imagine it) for his hearty reception in the soul; Can that be no other ways but by an Infallible Faith?

A Faith

Sic quotidie apud illos qui foris sunt intrat Christus per mulierem, in Ecclesiam, & credunt per istam famam, &c. Hen. à Gand. sum. p. 1. A. 10. q. 1.

Plus verbis Christi in Scriptura credit, quam Ecclesia testificant: quia propter illam jam credit Ecclesia. Et, si ipsa quidem, contraria Scriptura diceret, ipsi non crederet. Id.

P. 103.

A Faith supposed to be built on *infallible grounds*, I grant; but whether all, who do truly believe in *Christ*, do build their Faith on grounds in themselves *infallible*, my charity to some deluded souls in your Church (as well as honest, but ignorant persons elsewhere) gives me just reason to question. But still there is a greater subtilty behind, which is, if he believes the Scripture more than the Church, then he must believe the Church equally with the Scripture; for that must be the meaning of what you say, when he says, *He believes the Scripture more than the Church; he believes the Church; but how can he believe without Faith?* Ergo, this must be Divine Faith, or else all the rest comes to nothing. So that if I say, *I believe the Scripture more than you*, it follows, that *I believe you as much as the Scripture*, by the very same consequence. But you have gotten such a knack of contradicting your self, that poor *Gandavo* cannot fall into your hands, but you must make him do so too. When you say, *A Man cannot believe without Faith*, I dare justify it to be one of the greatest truths in your Book; but, if your meaning be, *A Man cannot believe without Divine Faith*, I hope we Protestants sufficiently confute that; for you dare not deny that we believe at all, but (just as the Devils do) we must (according to you) believe and tremble, because our Faith is not Divine and Infallible. But still your subtilty works with you, for because *Ganvadenſſis* saith, *That we must yield our first Faith to the Scripture, but secundam sub ista, a secondary Faith to the definitions and customs of the Catholick Church*: You cry out, *Here's prima & secunda fides; but yet both of them are properly and truly Faith*. But, Are both of them properly and truly Divine Faith? if so, How comes the distinction of the first and second, one subordinate to the other, if both be equally Divine and Infallible? Nay, according to your Principles, the Faith given to the Church must be the first Faith, and to the Scriptures the second under that; because, for the sake of the Churches Testimony, we are to believe the Scriptures. And, Do you really think, there may be no discovery of Infidelity in rejecting a sufficient Testimony for Faith, where there is not an Infallible Testimony? But, whatever you think, your great enemy, Reason, tells us the contrary; and therefore what follows of believing the Church, *sub pœnâ perfidiæ*, is to no more purpose than what went before. The strength therefore of all that you say as to this Testimony of *Gandavensis*, lies in the proof of this one thing; *That no Man can believe any thing without an Infallible Faith*; yet I verily believe that you have miserably perverted the Schoolmens words, and think no more Infallible Testimony requisite for it, than your own words.

S. 10. But, it may be, though yo do so ill by the Schoolmen, you may use the
P. 109. Fathers more civilly. Three things therefore you have to answer to those Testimonies of the Fathers, which seem most to make use of internal Arguments. 1. *That they use them not to such as had no Divine Faith, but to such as had.* 2. *That they do not use them as Primary, Infallible and Divine proofs, but as secondary arguments, persuasive only to such as believed Scripture to be Gods Word antecedently to them.* 3. *That they do not use only such proofs as are wholly internal to the Scripture it self.* As to the two first conditions, you say 'tis evident, these proofs were made by Christians, namely the Holy Fathers; and commonly to Christians, who lived in their times. And as clear is it, that they never pronounced them to be the Primary, Infallible and Divine Motives of their belief in that point, nor used they them as such. How false and absurd those Answers are, may appear by our precedent discourse, wherein we manifested, that the Christians insisted on those arguments there mentioned not for themselves and other Christians, but chiefly to convince and persuade by

by them the *Gentile world* to the belief of *Christianity*. And, Did they suppose these *Heathens* to have a *Divine Faith* already? Or, did they look on such arguments as only *secondary motives*, when these were the *chief*, nay only arguments which they used to persuade them; if they had other that were *Primary, Divine, and Infallible*, and only made use of *secondary, humane, probable motives*, they were guilty of the highest *betraying the Christian Cause* imaginable. And you make them only to *defend Christianity*, as *Vaninus* did *Divine Providence* with such silly and weak arguments, that by their overthrow, the belief of it might fall with them. Indeed, if they had pretended the *Infallible Testimony* of the *Church*, there might have been just reason for such a *Suspicion*, and any wise Men would have thought their design had been to make their Religion contemptible, and expose it to the derision of *Atheists*, instead of better establishing the *Foundations* of believing it. But those wise and holy Men knew better the *interest* of *Christianity*, than to offer to defend it by *Principles* in themselves false, and much more liable to question than that was which they were to prove by them: and therefore made choice of arguments in themselves *strong and evident*, and built on *Principles, common to themselves, and those whom they disputed against*, i. e. they urged them with the greatest strength of *Reason*, and the clearest evidence of *Divine Revelation*, and never questioned but that a *Faith* built on those grounds, if effectual for a *holy Life*, was a *true and Divine Faith*. It seems then, your cause cannot be maintained, without the most sharp and virulent reflections on those *Primitive Christians*, who among all those arguments whereby they so successfully prevailed over the *Gentile world*, never did so much as vouchsafe to mention the least pretence to *Infallibility*; for which they are now accused of using only the blunter weapons of *humane and fallible motives*, and not those *Primary and Divine Motives of Infallibility*. But this is not the first time we have seen, what desperate shifts a bad cause puts Men upon.

It may be yet, your strength may lye in your *last condition*, viz. That these arguments used by them, were not *internal*. For, 1. You say, That of *Miracles* is *external*; the *Scriptures* themselves work none, neither were ever any *Miracles* wrought to confirm, that all the *Books* now in the *Canon* (and no more) are the *Word of God*. I answer, 1. I have already told you of a double resolution of *Faith*, the one as to the *Divinity* of the *Doctrine*, the other as to the *Veracity* of the *Books* which contain it: when therefore *Miracles* are insisted on, it is not in order to the latter of these which we have sufficient assurance of without them, as I have already largely proved, both as to the *Truth* and *Integrity* of the *Canon of Scripture*; but *Miracles*, we say, are the arguments to prove the *Divinity* of the *Doctrine* by, because they attest the *Divine Revelation* of the persons, who deliver this *Doctrine* to the world. 2. As to us, who receive the report of those *Miracles*, as conveyed to us by the *Scripture*, those may be said to be *internal arguments* to the *Scripture*, which are there recorded in order to our believing the *Doctrine* therein contained to be *Divine*. The *Motives* of *Faith* being delivered to us now jointly with the *Doctrine*, although on different grounds, we believe the *Veracity* of the *Books of Scripture*, and the *Infallibility* of the *Doctrine* contained in it. We believe that the *Miracles* were truly done, because they are delivered to us by an unquestionable Tradition, in such *Authentick Writings* as the *Scriptures* are; but we believe the *Doctrine* contained in the *Books* to be *Divine*, because attested by such *Miracles*, and we believe the *Books of Scripture* to be *divinely inspired*, because such persons cannot be supposed to *falsify* to the world who

wrought such great Miracles. 2. You say, *The conversion of so many People and Nations by the Doctrine contained in Scripture, is also external to the Scripture.* But still you suppose that these arguments are brought to prove these Books to be *divinely inspired*, which is denied; we say only That the *admirable propagation of the Doctrine of the Gospel*, is a great argument that it was from God. And therefore, when afterwards you say, *That supposing all those arguments mentioned by the Bishop out of S. Augustine, to be internal to the Scripture, yet they cannot infallibly and divinely prove that Scripture is the Word of God.* If by Scripture, you mean the *Writings*, we pretend not to it; if by Scripture, you mean the *Doctrine* of it, we assert it, and think it no argument at all against that, which you add, *That persuade they may, but convince they cannot*; no doubt if they persuade, they do much more than convince; But, I suppose, your meaning is, they do it not *effectually*; if so, that is not the fault of the arguments, but of the person, who by his *obstinacy*, will not hearken to the *clearest evidence of Reason*. All that this can prove, is a necessity of *Divine Grace* to go along with *external evidence*, which you dare not assert, for fear of running into that *private Spirit*, which you objected to his Lordship on the same account. But it is very pretty which follows: You say, *Supposing that all those arguments mentioned, of Miracles, nothing carnal in the Doctrine, performance of it, and conversion of the world by it, were all of them internal to Scripture, yet they could not prove infallibly the Scripture to be the Word of God*; and to prove this, you tell us, *concerning the third and fourth, How can it ever be proved, that either the performance of this Doctrine, or the conversion of nations is internal to Scripture?* But, Did you not suppose them before to be internal to Scripture? and though they were so, yet could not prove the Scripture, &c? and to prove that, you say they cannot be proved *internal to Scripture*. Which is just as if I should say if you were Pope you would not be *Infallible*; and all the evidence I should give for it, should be only to prove that you were not Pope.

You conclude this Chapter with a *Wonder* (I mean not any thing of Reason which would really be so) But, say you, *who can sufficiently wonder, that his Lordship, for these four Motives, should so easily make the Scripture give Divine Testimony to it self, upon which our Faith must rest, and yet deny the same privilege to the Church? Seeing it cannot be denied, but that every one of these Motives are much more immediately and clearly applied to the Church, than to the Scripture.* What? more immediately and clearly; and so clearly, that it cannot be denied? Prove but any one of them as to that Church, whose Infallibility is in question, viz. the present Roman-Church, and I will yield you the rest. Produce but any one *undoubted Miracle*, to confirm the *Infallibility* of your Church, or the Pastors of it, shew your *Doctrine* (wherein it differs from ours) not to be *carnal*, manifest the performance of the *Christian Doctrine*, only in the members of your Church, prove that it is *your Church*, as such, which hath preached *this Doctrine*, and converted whole nations to the belief of it (in any other way than the Spaniards did the poor Indians) and we may begin to hearken with somewhat more patience to your arrogant and unreasonable pretence of *Infallibility*. Can any one then who hath any grain of reason left him, think that from these arguments, while his Lordship disputes most eagerly against the present Churches *Infallibility*, he argues mainly for it, as you very wisely conclude that Chapter? If this be arguing for your Churches *Infallibility*, much good may such arguments do you.

And

And so I come to the last part of my task as to this Controversie, which is, to examine your next Chapter, which puts us in hopes of seeing an End of this tedious Controversie: But this containing very little new in it (and therefore deserves not to be handled apart) will on that account admit of a quicker dispatch. In which the first Section begins with S. Austin's Testimony, which should have been considered before, and now it comes out with the same Answer attending it, which was given so lately concerning primary and infallible, and secondary and probable Motives of Faith, the vanity of which is sufficiently discovered. Whereas in your Margent you bring an example of such a probable Motive, viz. when S. Austin saith to Faustus. *That as constant Tradition was sufficient for him to believe that that Epistle was Manichæus his, which went under his name; so the same Tradition was sufficient to him to prove the Gospel was S. Matthew's, which was so universally received for his, ever since the writing of it.* I am so far from thinking this a meer probable Motive, that it is the highest evidence the matter is capable of, and so S. Austin thought. Your paralleling the saying of Waldensis (*That if the Church should speak any thing contrary to Scripture, he would not believe her*) with another which you pretend to be S. Austin's; *If the Scripture should speak any thing contrary to the Church, we could not believe that neither; and then saying that both proceed on an impossible supposition,* must imply, that it is an equal impossibility for the Church to deliver any thing contrary to the Doctrine of Scripture, as for the Scripture to contradict it self; for to say, The Scripture should contradict the Church, signifies nothing, because the Being of the Church is founded on the Doctrine of Scripture. All that S. Austin saith, in the place you refer us to, comes to no more than this, If the Church were found deceived in the Writings of Scripture, then there could be no ground of any firm assent to them. And, is this, I pray, a fit parallel for that speech of Waldensis? Is this to say, If the Scripture speak any thing against the Church, it is not to be believed?

In your next Sect. N. 2, 3. you fall from Parallels, to Circles, and Semi-circles (as you call them) in which you only shew us your faculty of mumbling the same things over and over, concerning his Lordships mistaking the Question, about Infallible and Divine Faith, Apostolical Tradition, the formal Object of Faith, which I must, out of charity to the Readers patience, beg him to look back for the several Answers, if he thinks any thing needs it; for I am now quite tired with these Repetitions, there being not one word added here, but what hath been answered already. But, lest these should not enough tire us, the next Sect. N. 4. consists of the old puff past of ultimate Motive, and formal Object, of the Infallibility which is not simply Divine, and others of a like nature, whose vanity hath been detected in the very entrance into this Controversie.

It seems you had a great mind to give the Bishop a blow, when you teach as far, as from p. 103. to p. 115, to do it, and yet fall short of it at last; for, tho' you charge him with a false citation of S. Austin, for these words, *fidei ultima resolutio est in Deum illuminantem*, yet in that Chapter, tho' not the words, yet the sense is there extant, when he gives that account of Christian Faith, *That it comes not by the authority of Men, but from God himself confirming and enlightning our mind.* Is not here a plain resolution of Faith in Deum illuminantem? And therefore your charge of false citation, and your confident denial, *That there is any such Text to be found either there, or any where else in all S. Augustine,* argue, you are not careful what you say, so you may but throw dirt in your adversaries face;

Non jam hominibus, sed ipso Deo intrinsecus mentem nostram firmante & illuminante. Aug. c. ep. Manich. c. 14.

easily know from whence it comes, by the *foulness* of your fingers. And for your other challenge, of producing any Testimony of the Fathers which saith, That we must resolve our Faith of Scripture into the Light of Scripture; I hope the Testimonies I have in this Chapter mentioned, may teach you a little more modesty: and for the other part of it, That we cannot believe the Scripture infallibly for the Churches authority, as far as a Negative can be proved, I dare appeal to the judgement of any one, Whether it be possible to believe that the Fathers judged, the Certainty, much less Infallibility of Christian Faith did depend on the Churches Infallible Testimony, and yet never upon the most just occasion do so much as mention it, but rather speak very much to the contrary.

- S. 12. His Lordship having thus at large delivered his mind in this important Controversie; to make what he had said the more portable, sums up the substance of it in several Considerations. Which being only a recapitulation of what had been fully discussed already, will need the shorter Vindication, in some brief structures, where you unjustly quarrel with them. To his 1. That it seems reasonable, that since all Sciences suppose Principles, Theology should be allowed some too: the chiefest of which is, That the Scriptures
- P. 114. are of Divine Authority; your Answer is considerable; viz. that he confounds Theology, a discursive Science, with Faith, which is an act of the Understanding, produced by an Impulse of the Will, &c. But not to examine what hath been already handled, of the power of the Will in the act of Faith, it is plain when his Lordship speaks of Theology, he means Theology, and not Faith; and the intent of this Consideration was to shew, the unreasonableness of starting this Question in a Theological Dispute about the Church. In your Answer to the second, you say, That Fallible Motives cannot produce Certainty, which if you would prove, you would do more to the purpose than you have done yet, and by this argument, I could not be certain, whether you had done it or no, unless you brought some Infallible Motives to prove it. The third you pass over. The fourth you grant, though not very consistently with what you elsewhere say: As to what you say in answer to the fifth, concerning Miracles, I agree with you in it, having elsewhere sufficiently declared my self as to them. For the sixth you refer to your former Answer, and so do I to the reply to it. In the seventh, his Lordship proves the necessity of some revelation from God rationally and strongly, and thence infers, That either there never was any such Revelation, or that the Scripture is that Revelation, and that's it we Christians labour to make good against all Atheism, Prophaneness, and Infidelity.
- P. 115. To which you have two Exceptions. 1. That this cannot be proved by the meer Light of Scripture, which His Lordship never pretended to. 2. That he leaves out the Word, only, which was the cause of the whole Controversie; What, between Christians and Atheists? For of that Controversie, he there speaks; but since you are so fond of your unwritten Revelations, pray prove the necessity of them as strongly against Atheists, as his Lordship hath done the necessity of a written one. In the last Consideration he musters up all the several arguments whereby Men may be perswaded, That this Revelation is contained in those Books we call the Scripture; as the Tradition of the Church, the Testimony of former Ages, the consent of times, the Harmony of Prophets, and the Prophecies fulfilled, the success of the Doctrine, the constancy of it, the spiritual nature and efficacy of it, and lastly, the inward light and excellency of the Text it self; which, with a great deal of Rhetorick, is there set forth. But to all this you say no more than what hath been abundantly disproved, viz. That all these only justify our belief, when it is received as the ancients received it, upon the Infallible
- P. 116. Authority

Authority of Church Tradition, but never otherwise. Whereas we have proved, that the *ancients* received it only on the same grounds, which are here mentioned, and therefore certainly are *sufficient* not only to *justifie* our Faith, but to *perswade* us to believe.

Your argument against what his Lordship saith of the necessity of the Spirit's assistance with these Motives, and the Light of Scripture for producing Divine Faith, will equally hold against all those of your own side, who hold the necessity of God's Spirit for believing the Churches Infallibility, and against all such of both sides, who hold any necessity of Divine Grace, for then you must say, that either that Grace is not necessary in order to salvation, or that those who want it, are neither truly Christians, nor capable of salvation. And how horridly soever these consequences sound in the ears of the unlearned, they can sound no worse than those multitudes of Scriptures do which tell Men, That without true Divine Faith, and real Grace, they are under eternal condemnation. But, it may be, that the unlearned may not be affrighted with such sentences as those are, you think it a great deal better to let them hear little or nothing of the Scripture, and to let them be continually entertained with the sweet and melodious voice of the Church. No doubt, you thought, your next argument had done the business effectually; For (say you) to make them more sensible of the foulness of this error, viz. the danger of such who do not savingly believe, Let them consider, that when young and unlearned Christians are taught to say their Creed, and profess their belief of the Articles contained in it, before they read Scripture, they are taught to lye, and profess to do that, which they neither do, nor can do in his Tenet. An excellent argument against making Children say their Creed! but, Will not the same hold against all publick using of the Creed, because it is unquestionable but there are some who do not savingly or divinely believe it? Nay, Will it not much more hold against any in your Church, saying their Creed at all, unless they first believe your Church to be Infallible, which is very well known that all do not. For then, according to you, they do but lye, and profess to do that which they neither do, nor can do, without the Churches Infallible Testimony: And therefore you must begin a new work of Catechising the members of your Church, to know whether they believe the Churches Infallibility, before they can say their Creed. Unless you solve it among your selves, by saying, It is not a formal lye, but only an equivocation, which many of you say, is lawful in case of danger, as you see apparently this is. But if the equivocation be said only to lye in the word Believe; you might easily discern the weakness of your argument, through it. For if some may truly believe what they do not savingly believe, there is no lye certainly told, in saying, They do believe as far as they do; which is by a firm assent to the Truth of all the Articles of Faith, by that which is call'd an historical, or dogmatical Faith, where there may be no saving Faith. But that because Children are taught (as a short systeme of the Articles of Faith) to say their Creed, we must be convinced of the foulness of our error, is an apparent evidence, that either you apprehended our understandings to be very weak, or that you sufficiently discover your own to be so.

The only quarrel which you have with his Lordship's Synthetical way is, That he confounds his Reader with multiplicity of arguments, and weakens the authority of the Church, without which (if you may be believed) he might tire himself and others, but never be able to make a clear resolution of Faith. How clear an account you have given of Faith in your Analytical way, by the Authority of the Church, hath been sufficiently laid open to you; but I wonder not that you quarrel with multiplicity of arguments, there being nothing which

§. 13.

P. 116.

§. 14.

P. 117. D. 7.

which doth really weaken the *authority of your Church* so much as *they* do, and they are Men certainly of your *temper*, who will be soon tired with too much reason. What follows concerning the *captiousness of the Question* as first propounded, and the *vicious Circle* you would free your selves of, by the *Motives of Credibility*; deserve no further answer. Only when you would make *A. C. go your way*, and both together prove the *Church Infallible independently on Scripture*, you did not certainly consider, that it is an *Infallibility by Promise*, which you challenge, and, for that end, in the precedent Chapter, were those places of *Scripture* produced by *A. C.* and urged by you. All that I shall return by way of *Answer* to your tedious discourse concerning *Scriptures being a Principle supposed among Christians* (the main of it depending on the circumstances of the dispute between his Lordship and Mr. Fisher) shall be in these following particulars. 1. That in all Controversies among *Christians*, whose decision depends upon the *authority of Scripture*, the *Scripture* must be supposed as granted to be of *Divine Authority* by both parties. 2. That in that *Question*, whether the *Scripture* contains all necessary things of *Faith*, that necessity must be supposed to relate to the things which depend upon *Scripture*, and therefore implies it believed on other grounds, that this *Scripture* is of *Divine Revelation*. For the *Question* is, whether *God* hath consigned his will so fully to us, in this *Revelation* of himself, that nothing necessary to be believed is left out of it? For Men then to say, That this is left out of it, viz. to believe that this is a *Divine Revelation*, is an unreasonable Cavil, it being supposed in the very *Question*, that it is so. 3. That in this sense the *Scripture* may be said to be a *supposed Principle*, because it hath a different way of probation, from particular *Objects of Faith* revealed in *Scripture*. For to a *rational Enquirer*, who seems to doubt of the Truth of *Scriptures*, it is equally absurd to give him any one of these three Answers. 1. That it is a *Principle to be supposed*: for, though it be supposed as to the particular debate depending on *Scripture*; yet it is fond and absurd to say, It must be *supposed* when it is the thing in question. 2. That it is *known merely by its own Light*: for the person I have to deal with, supposing himself equally capable to judge of *Reason* and *Evidence*, as my self, it doth but betray the weakness of my cause, or my inability to manage it, to pretend that to be evident, which it is much more evident, that he doth not think so; and it is only to tell him, my *Understanding* must rule his, and that whatever appears to me to have *Light* in it self, ought likewise so to appear to him. 3. It is as absurd as either of the other two, to say, That you will prove to a *rational Enquirer*, the *Scripture* to be *God's Word*, by an *unwritten Word of God*. For, 1. His Enquiry is, Whether there be any *Word of God* or no, you prove there is, because there is, for that is all you prove by your *unwritten Word*. He denies, or at least questions, Whether there be any, and particularly instanceth in *Scripture*; you think to end the *Question*, by telling him, He must believe it to be so, because there is another *Word of God* which attests it, which, instead of ending the first *Question*, begets a great many more. For, 2. He will be more to seek, concerning this *unwritten Word* than before; because he might use his *Reason* in judging concerning the *written Word*, but cannot as to this *unwritten*; it being only told him, There is such a thing, but he knows not what it is, how far it extends, who must deliver it, what evidence this hath beyond the other, that it comes from *God*, that it must be used as an argument to prove it with. If you send him to the *Infallibility* of the *Church*, you must either presume him of a very weak *Understanding*, or else he would easily discern your perfect juggling in this; the veins of which I have discovered throughout this discourse. There remains nothing then but

but Reason, a Principle common to us both, by which I must prove, that the Scriptures are from God, which Reason partly makes use of the Churches Tradition, not in any notion of Infallibility, but meerly as built on Principles common to humane nature, and partly uses those other arguments which prove by the greatest rational evidence, that the Doctrine contained in Scripture, was from God; and if this were all the meaning of saying, The Scriptures are a Principle supposed, because of a different way of proving them, from particular objects of Faith, you can have no reason to deny it.

The next thing his Lordship insists on, is, *That the Jews never had, nor can have any other proof, that the Old Testament is the Word of God, than we have of the New.* In your Answer to which, I grant that which you contend for, *That the Tradition of Scriptures among them, was by their immediate Ancestors as well as others; I grant, That their Faith was not a Scientifical Knowledge, but a firm and perfect assurance only* (but understand not what you mean, by saying, *That otherwise it would not be meritorious*) but am as far to seek as ever for any Infallibility in the Jewish Church, which should in every age be the ground of believing the Books of the Old Testament to be divinely inspired. And if you will prove a constant succession of Prophets from Moses till our Saviour's appearing (which you seem willing to believe) you would do something towards it; but for your permanent Infallible Authority in the High Priest and his Clergy, I have already shewed it to be a groundless, if not a wilful mistake.

What remains concerning the nature of Infallibility (which at last his Lordship makes to be no more than *that which excludes all possibility of doubting, and therefore grants, that an Infallible Assurance may be had by Ecclesiastical and Humane proof*) and how far that is requisite to Faith; concerning moral Certainty, and what Assurance may be had by it; concerning the Canon of Scripture, Apostolical Tradition, the unwritten Word, S. Austin's Testimony about the Church, they are all points so fully discussed before, that out of pity to the Reader, I must refer him to their several places, which when he hath thoroughly considered, I will give him leave to sum up the several victories you have obtained in the management of it, which will be much more honourable for you, than for your self to do it, as you do most triumphantly in the end of this Controversie concerning the Resolution of Faith. And although I have not been much surprized with your attempts, yet I shall heartily conclude this great Debate with your last words in it. *The Consequence I leave to the serious consideration of the Judicious Reader. I beseech God he may make benefit of it to his eternal felicity.*

11.



PART II.

Of Schism.

CHAP. I.

Of the Universal Church.

The Question of Schism explained. The nature of it enquired into. Several general Principles laid down for clearing the present Controversie. Three grounds of the charge of Schism on Protestant Churches by our Author. The first, of the Roman Churches being the Catholick Church, entred upon. How far the Roman Church may be said to be a true Church. The distinction of a Church morally and metaphysically true justified. The grounds of the Unity of the Catholick Church, as to Doctrine and Government. Cardinal Perron's distinction of the formal, causal, and participative Catholick Church examined. The true sense of the Catholick Church in Antiquity manifested from St. Cyprian, and several cases happening in his time: as, the Schism of Novatianus at Rome; the case of Felicissimus and Fortunatus. Several other Instances out of Antiquity to the same purpose, by all which it is manifest that the unity of the Catholick Church had no dependance on the Church of Rome. The several testimonies to the contrary of St. Ambrose, St. Hierom, John Patriarch of Constantinople, St. Augustine, Optatus, &c. particularly examined; and all found short of proving that the Roman Church is the Catholick Church. The several Answers of his Lordship to the testimonies of St. Cyprian, St. Hierome, St. Greg. Nazianzene, St. Cyril, and Rufinus, about the infallibility of the Church of Rome, justified. From all which it appears that the making the Roman-Church to be the Catholick, is a great Novelty and perfect Jesuitism.

§. I.



Ince so great and considerable parts of the *Christian Church*, have in these last ages been divided in communion from each other, the great contest and enquiry hath been, which party stands guilty of the cause of the present distance and separation. For, both sides retain still so much of the common *Christianity*, as to acknowledge that no Religion doth so strictly oblige the owners of it to peace and unity as the *Christian Religion* doth; and yet notwithstanding this, we find these breaches so far from closing, that, supposing the same grounds to continue, a reconciliation seems to humane reason

reason impossible: An evidence of which, is, that those persons who either out of a generous desire of seeing the wounds of the *Christian* world healed, or out of some private interest or design, have made it their business to propound terms of reconciliation between the divided parties, have been equally rejected by those parties they have professed themselves the members of. For whether any of the *Roman Communion* have ingenuously confessed the great corruptions crept into that *Church*, and desired a reformation of them, or any of the *Protestant Communion* have endeavoured to excuse, palliate, or plead for the *corruptions* of the *Roman Church*: we find how little encouragement they have had for such undertakings from that *Church* whose Communion they have professed to retain. The distance then being so great as it is, it is a very necessary enquiry what the *cause* of it is, and where the main fault lies; and it being acknowledged that there is a possibility that *corruptions* may get into a *Christian Church*, and it being impossible to prove that *Christianity* obligeth Men to communicate with a *Church* in all those *corruptions* its Communion may be tainted with, it seems evident to reason that the cause of the breach must lye there, where the corruptions are owned and imposed as conditions of Communion. For, can any one imagine it should be a fault in any to keep off from Communion, where they are so far from being obliged to it, that they have an obligation to the contrary, from the principles of their common Christianity? and where Men are bound not to communicate, it is impossible to prove their not communicating to be *Schism*. For there can be no *Schism*, but where there is an obligation to communion; *Schism* being nothing else but a wilful violation of the bonds of *Christian Communion*; and therefore when ever you would prove the *Protestants* guilty of *Schism*, you must do it by proving they were bound to communicate with your *Church* in those things, which they are *Protestants* for disowning of. Or that there is so absolute and unlimited an obligation to continue in the *Society* of your *Church*, that no *conditions* can be so hard, but we are bound rather to submit to them, than not joyn in *Communion* with you. But we who look on the nature of a *Christian Society* in general, the *Foundations* of its *constitution*, the *ends* and *designs* of it, cannot think our selves obliged to Communion in those things which *undermine* those *Foundations*, and *contradict* those *ends*.

This being a matter of so vast consequence, in order to the settling Mens minds in the present disputes of the *Christian* world, before I come to particulars, I shall lay down those general principles which may manifest how free *Protestants* are, from all imputation of *Schism*. *Schism* then importing a *violation* of that *Communion* which we are *obliged* to, the most natural way for understanding what *Schism* is, is to enquire what the *Foundations* are of *Christian Communion*, and how far the *bonds* of it do extend. Now the *Foundations* of *Christian Communion* in general depend upon the acknowledgement of the *truth* of *Christian Religion*. For that *Religion* which *Christ* came to deliver to the world being supposed *true*, is the reason why any look on themselves as obliged to profess it; which *obligation* extending to all persons who have the same grounds to believe the *truth* of it, thence ariseth the ground of *Society* in this profession, which is a common *obligation* on several persons joynning together in some *acts* of common concernment to them. The truth then of *Christian Religion* being acknowledged by several persons, they find in this *Religion* some *actions* which are to be performed by several persons in *Society* with each other. From whence ariseth that more immediate obligation to *Christian Society*, in all those who profess them-

selves *Christians*; and the whole number of *these* who own the truth of Christian Religion and are thereby obliged to joyn in Society with each other, is that which we call the *Catholick Church*. But although there be such a relation to each other in all *Christians* as to make them one common Society; yet for the performance of particular *acts* of communion, there must be lesser *Societies* wherein persons may joyn together in the actions belonging to them. But still the *obligation* to communion in these *lesser*, is the same with that which constitutes the great body of *Christians*, which is the owning *Christianity* as the only true Religion and way to eternal Happiness. And therefore those lesser *Societies* cannot in justice make the necessary conditions of communion narrower, than those which belong to the *Catholick Church*, i. e. those things which declare Men *Christians*, ought to capacitate them for communion with *Christians*. But here we are to consider that as to be a *Christian* supposeth Mens owning the *Christian Religion* to be true, so the conveyance of that Religion being to us now in those *Books* we call the *Scriptures*, there must be an acknowledgement of them as the indispensable rule of *Faith* and *Manners*, which is, That these *Books* are the great Charter of the *Christian Society*, according to which it must be governed.

§. 3.

These things being premised as the foundation in general of *Christian Society*, we shall the better understand how far the *obligation* to communion in it doth extend. For which it must be considered, that the grounds of continuance in *Communion*, must be suitable and proportionable to the first reason of entring into it. No Man being obliged by vertue of his being in a Society, to agree in any thing which tends to the apparent ruine of that Society; but he is obliged to the contrary, from the general grounds of his first admission into it. His primary *obligation* being to preserve the honour and interest of it, and to joyn in *acts* of it so far as they tend to it. Now the main end of the *Christian Society* being the promotion of God's honour and the salvation of Men's souls, the primary *obligation* of Men entring into it, is the advancement of these ends, to joyn in all *acts* of it so far as they tend to these ends; but if any thing come to be required directly repugnant to these ends, those Men of whom such things are required, are bound not to communicate in those lesser *Societies* where such things are imposed, but to preserve their communion with the *Catholick Society* of *Christians*. But these general discourses seeming more obscure, it will be necessary for the better subserviency of them to our design, to deduce them into particulars. Setting then aside the *Catholick Society* of *Christians*, we come to enquire how far Men are bound to communicate with any lesser *Society*, how extensive soever it may pretend its communion to be.

1. There is no Society of *Christians* of any one Communion, but may impose some things to be believed or practised which may be repugnant to the general Foundations of *Christian Society*. But if any Society shall pretend a necessity of communion with her, because it is impossible this should be done by her: this privilege must in reason be as evident as the common grounds of *Christianity* are; nay much more evident, because the belief of *Christianity* it self, doth (upon this pretence) depend on the knowledge of such *Infallibility*, and the indispensable obligation to communion depends upon it.

2. There being a possibility acknowledged, that particular Churches may require unreasonable conditions of communion; the obligation to communion

cannot

cannot be absolute and indispensable; but only so far as nothing is required destructive to the ends of Christian Society. Otherwise Men would be bound to destroy that which they believe, and to do the most unjust and unreasonable things. But the great difficulty lies in knowing when such things are required, and who must be the judge in that case: to which I answer,

3. Nothing can be more unreasonable, than that the Society imposing such conditions of communion should be judge, whether those conditions be just and equitable or no. If the question only were in matters of peace, and convenience, and order, the judgement of the Society ought to over-rule the judgements of particular persons, but in such cases where great Bodies of Christians, judge such things required, to be unlawful conditions of communion, what justice or reason is there, that the party accused should sit Judge in her own cause?

4. Where there is sufficient evidence from Scripture, reason, and tradition, that such things which are imposed are unreasonable conditions of Christian communion, the not communicating with that Society which requires these things cannot incur the guilt of Schism. Which necessarily follows from the precedent grounds, because none can be obliged to communion in such cases, and therefore the not communicating is no culpable separation.

5. By how much the Societies are greater which are agreed in not communicating with a Church imposing such conditions, by how much the power of those who rule those Societies so agreeing is larger, by so much the more justifiable is the Reformation of any Church from these abuses, and the settling the bonds of Christian communion without them. And on those grounds, viz. the Church of Rome imposing unlawful conditions of communion, it was necessary not to communicate with her; and on the Church of Englands power to reform it self by the assistance of the Supreme power, it was lawful and justifiable not only to redress those abuses, but to settle the Church upon its proper and true foundations. So that the Church of Rome imposing unlawful conditions of communion, is the reason why we do not communicate with her, and the Church of Englands power to govern and take care of her self, is the reason of our joyning together in the service of God upon the principles of our Reformation. On these grounds I doubt not but to make it appear, how free the Church of England is from all imputation of Schism.

These things being thus in general premised, we come to consider what those principles are on which you can found so high a charge as that of Schism on the Protestant Churches. And having thoroughly considered your way of management of it, I find all that you have to say may be resolved into one of these three grounds. 1. That the Roman Church is the true and only Catholick Church. 2. That our Churches could have no power or cause to divide in their Communion from her. 3. That the authority of the Roman Church is so great, that upon no pretence soever could it be lawful to withdraw from Communion with her. I confess, if you can make good any one of these three, you do something to the purpose; but how little ground you have to charge us with Schism from any of these Principles, will be the design of this Part at large to manifest. I begin then with the first, which is the pretence of your Churches being the Catholick Church: and here we again enter the lists to see how fairly you deal with your Adversary. Mr. Fisher saith, That from the Controversie of the resolution of Faith the Lady called

P. 127.
sect. 20.
D. 1.

N. 2.

P. 127. c. 2.
D. 1.

P. 128.
D. 2.

them; and desiring to hear, whether the Bishop would grant the Roman Church to be the right Church? the Bishop (saith he) granted that it was. To which his Lordship answers (after a just complaint of the abuse of disputations, by Mens resolution to hold their own, though it be by unworthy means and disparagement of truth) that the question was neither asked in that form, nor so answered. And that there is a great deal of difference (especially as Romanists handle the question of the Church) between The Church and A Church, and there is some between a True Church and a Right Church. For the Church may import the only true Church, and perhaps the root and ground of the Catholick. And this (saith he) I never did grant of the Roman Church, nor ever mean to do. But A Church, can imply no more, than that it is a member of the whole. And this I never did (saith he) nor ever will deny, if it fall not absolutely away from Christ. That it is a True Church I granted also; but not a Right. For Truth only imports the being; right, perfection in conditions; thus a Thief is a true Man, tho' not an upright Man. So a corrupt Church may be true, as a Church is a company of Men which profess the Faith of Christ and are baptized into his Name; but it is not therefore a right Church, either in doctrine or manners. And this (he saith) is acknowledged by very learned Protestants before him. This is the substance of his Lordships answer, to which we must consider what you reply, That about the terms of the Lady's question you grant to be a verbal Controversie; and that whatever her words were, she was to be understood to demand this alone, viz. Whether the Roman were not the True, Visible, Infalible Church out of which none can be saved; for herein (you say) she had from the beginning of the Controversie desired satisfaction: And in this subject the Roman Church could not be any Church at all, unless it were the Church and a Right Church. The reason is because S. Peter's successor, being the Bishop of Rome, and Head of the whole Church (as you tell us you will prove anon) that must needs be the Church καὶ ἰερόν if it be any Church at all. And because the Church can be but one, if it be a true Church it must be the right Church. But all this amounts only to a confident assertion of that which wants evident proof, which is, that the notion of a Church relates to one as appointed the Head of the whole Church, without which it would be no Church at all. Which being a thing so hard to be understood, and therefore much harder to be proved, we must be content to wait your leisure till you shall think fit to prove it. When you therefore tell us afterwards, That the Universal Church supposes the acknowledgement of the same Vicar of Christ, and that those Dioceses which agree in this acknowledgement as well as in the same Faith, and communion of the same Sacraments make up one and the same Universal Church; When you further add, That the Roman Church is therefore stiled the Church, because it is the seat of the Vicar of Christ, and chief Pastor of the Church Universal: I can only say to all these confident affirmations, that if you had sate in the chair your self, you could not have said more or proved less. It is not therefore in what sense words may be taken by you (for who questions but you may abuse words?) but in what sense they ought to be taken. You may call the Bishop of Rome the Vicar of Christ, but before you can expect our submission to him, you must prove that he is so. You may call the Roman Church, The Church, if you please, among your selves: but if by that you would persuade us there can be no Church but that, you would do an office of kindness to offer a little at some small proof of it, i. e. as much as the cause, and your abilities will afford. And what if the Antients by a true Church did mean an Orthodox Church? I know but one of these things will follow from it, either that they took a true Church for one morally and not metaphysically true; or that if your Church be not an Orthodox Church, it can be none at all. From hence you proceed

to quarrel with his Lordship for saying, *That may be a true Church which is not a right Church* (which is all the thanks he hath for his kindness to you) for (say you) *How can you call that a true Church in which Men are not taught the way to Heaven, but to eternal Perdition?* Which is as much as to ask, How you can call that Man a true Man that hath a Leprosie upon him? But if you had considered, what his Lordship had said, you would never have made such an objection. For his Lordship doth not speak of the soundness of a Church, but of the metaphysical entity of it. For he saith, *It is true in that sense as* N. 3.
ens and verum, Being and True, are convertible one with another; and every Sect. 20.
thing that hath a Being is truly that Being which it is in truth of substance. N. 2. But (say you) *How can that be a true Church which teacheth the way to eternal Perdition by some false Doctrine in matter of Faith?* Because it either teacheth something to be the Word of God which is not; or denies that to be his Word which is: to err in this sort is certainly to commit an high and mortal offence against the honour and veracity of God, and consequently the direct way to eternal Perdition. An excellent discourse to prove that no Man can be saved that is not Infallible! For if he be not infallible he may either teach something to be God's which is not, or deny that to be his Word that is; either of which being a mortal offence against the honour and veracity of God, it is impossible any Man that is not Infallible should be saved: either then we must put off that humanity which exposes us to error, or pronounce it impossible for any Men to be saved, or else assert that there may be error where God's veracity is not denied. And if so, then not only Men severally but a Society of Men may propound that for truth which is not, and yet not mortally offend against God's veracity; supposing that Society of Men doth believe (though falsely) that this is therefore true because revealed by God. In which case that Church may be a true Church in one sense, though an erroneous Church in another: true, as there is a possibility of salvation in it; erroneous, as delivering that for truth which is not so. But here is a great deal of difference between a Church acknowledging her self fallible, and that which doth not. For suppose a Church propose something erroneous to be believed, if she doth not arrogate Infallibility to her self in that proposal, but requires Men to search and examine her Doctrine by the Word of God, the danger is nothing so great to the Persons in her Communion; but when a Church pretends to be Infallible and teacheth errors, that Church requiring those errors to be believed upon her Authority, without particular examination of the Doctrines proposed, is chargeable with a higher offence against the honour and veracity of God, and doth as much as in her lies (in your expression) *teach Men the way to eternal Perdition.* And of all sorts of blind guides it is most dangerous following such who pretend to be Infallible in their blindness; and it is a great miracle if such do not fall past recovery. The more therefore you aggravate the danger of error, the worse still you make the condition of your Church, where Men are bound to believe the Church Infallible, when she proposeth the most dangerous errors. When you say, *The whole Church is not liable to these inconveniencies of seducing or being seduced,* if you mean (as you speak) of that which is truly the whole Church of Christ, you are to seek for an Adversary in it; if you mean the Roman Church, you are either seduced or endeavour to seduce in saying so, when neither that is or can be the whole Church, neither is it free from believing or proposing errors, as will appear afterwards. You quarrel with his Lordship again, for his Similitude of a Man that may be termed a Man and not be honest, and say it comes not home to the case.

But we must see, how well you have fitted it. Instead of a Man, you would have a Saint put, and then, (you say) the Parallel would have held much

much better. But certainly then you mean only such *Saints* as *Rome* takes upon her to *Canonize*; for the Question was of one that might be a *Man*, and not be honest, Will you say the same of your *Saint* too? If instead of *Saint*, you had put his *Holiness* in, there are some in the World would not have quarrelled with you for it. But you are an excellent Man at parallelling Cases: His Lordship was speaking of the *Metaphysical Truth* of a Church being consistent with moral Corruptions, for which he instanced in a Thiefs being truly a Man, though not an honest Man; now you, to mend the matter, make choice of moral Integrity, being consistent with Metaphysical Truth, which is of a Saint, and a Man. And, Dost not this now come home to our case? That which follows, to shew the Incongruity of his Lordship's Similitude, would much more shew your wit, if it were capable of tolerable sense: For, you say, the word Church in our present debate, implies not a simple or uncompounded Term, as that of Man, but is a Compound of Substance and Accidents together. We had thought Man had been a compound of substance and accidents, as well as a Church: Or, Did you mean some transubstantiated Man, that had accidents without substance? But as his Lordship spake of a true real Man, who yet might want moral Integrity; so he supposed there might be a true real Church, as to the essential parts of it, which yet might be in other respects a corrupted and defiled Church. But when you add, That the notion of a Church implies Integrity and Perfection of Conditions, still you betray your weak or wilful mistakes of a Church Morally for Metaphysically true. If you will prove it impossible for a Church to retain its Being, that hath any errors in Doctrine, or corruptions in Practice, you will do something to the purpose: But when you have done it, see what you get by it; for then we shall not so much as acknowledge your Church to be Metaphysically a true Church. If his Lordship therefore be so charitable, as to say, That because your Church receives the Scripture as a Rule of Faith: (though but as a partial and imperfect Rule) and both the Sacraments as Instrumental causes and seals of Grace (though they add more, and misuse these) it cannot but be a true Church in essence: And you, on the other side, say, If it doth misuse the Sacraments, and make the Scripture an imperfect Rule of Faith, it would be Unchurched; Let the Reader judge, whether his Lordship's Charity for, or your own Testimony against your Church, be built on better grounds. What follows concerning the Holy Catholick Church in the Apostles Creed, the intire Catholick Faith in the Athanasian Creed, the Churches being the Spouse of Christ, and a pure Virgin, are all things as true in themselves, as your Church is little concerned in them. The truly Catholick Church being quite another thing from that which goes under the name of the Roman Catholick Church; and this latter may prostitute her self to error, while the other remains a pure Virgin; and it is only your saying, That yours only is the Catholick Church, which is in effect to say, That Christ hath a Harlot to his Spouse, as you speak.

§. 6. To omit that which you call, A further skirmishing about the forms of words, and whether it savoured more of prudence, and charity, or cunning in the Jesuite, to instruct the Lady what Questions she should ask; we come to that which is the main subject of this Chapter, viz. Whether the Church be stiled Catholick by its agreeing with Rome, which (you say) was a received and known Truth in the Ancient Church, but is so far from being in the least true, that his Lordship deservedly calls it, A perfect Jesuitism. For (saith he) in all the Primitive Times of the Church, a Man, or a Family, or a National Church were accounted right and orthodox, as they agreed with the Catholick Church, but the Catholick was never then measured or judged by Man, Family, or Nation. But now in the Jesuits

Jesuits new School, the One, Holy, Catholick Church, must be measured by that which is in the Diocese or City of Rome, or of them which agreed with it; and not Rome by the Catholick. So upon the matter, belike the Christian Faith was committed to the custody of the Roman, not of the Catholick Church; and a Man cannot agree with the Catholick Church of Christ (in this new Doctrine of A. C.) unless he agree with the Church of Rome; but if he agree with that, all is safe, and he is as orthodox, as he need be. To which you seem to answer at first by some slight tergiversations, as though this did not follow from A. C.'s words, and that the Lady did not trouble her self with such Punctilio's as those of the agreement of the Catholick Church with Rome, or Rome's agreeing with the Catholick Church, but at last you take heart, and affirm stoutly, That the Church is stiled Catholick from its agreement with Rome, and that this is no Jesuitism, but a received and known Truth in the Ancient Church. In these terms then I fix my self, and this present dispute; as containing the proper state of the Controversie concerning the Catholick Church. And if you can make it appear that the Church is stiled Catholick by agreeing with Rome, and that this was a received Truth in the Ancient Church, then you may very plausibly charge us with Schism in our separation from Rome; but if the contrary be made evident, by your own pretence we are freed from that charge. P. 131.

Now in the handling this Controversie, you first explain your terms, P. 130. n. 5. and then produce your Testimonies. In the explication of your terms, you tell us, The word Catholick may be used in three different Acceptions, viz, either formally, causally, or by way of participation. Formally, the Universal Church, i. e. the Society of all true particular Churches, united together in one Body, in one Communion under one Head, is called Catholick. Causally the Church of Rome is stiled Catholick, because it hath an influence and force to cause Universality in the whole body of the Church Catholick; to which two things are necessary, Multitude and Unity. The Roman Church therefore, which as a Center of Ecclesiastical Communion, infuses this Unity which is the form of Universality, into the Catholick Church, and thereby causes in her Universality, may be called Catholick causally, though she be but a particular Church. As he that commands a whole Army is stiled General, though he be but a particular Person. Thirdly, every particular Orthodox Church is termed Catholick participative, by way of participation, because they agree in, and participate of the Doctrine and Communion of the Catholick Church. For which (you bring) the instance of the Church of Smyrna writing to the Catholick Church of Philomilion, &c. Thus we see (say you) both how properly the Roman Church is called Catholick, and how the Catholick Church it self takes causally the denomination of Universal or Catholick from the Roman, considered as the chief particular Church, infusing Unity into all the rest, as having dependence of her, and relation to her. Thus I have recited your words, that we may fully understand your meaning, the substance of which is couched in your last words, That the reason why any Church was accounted Catholick, was from its Union with the Church of Rome. But if it appear that this sense of the Catholick Church is wholly a stranger to Antiquity, That the Catholick Church was so call'd upon far different accounts than those mentioned by you; if the Church of Rome had no other relation to the Catholick Church but as a Member of it as other Churches were, then all this discourse of yours comes to nothing, and that is it which I now undertake to prove. Now the Unity of the Catholick Church lying in two things, the Doctrine and the Government of it, if in neither of these it had any dependence of the Church of Rome, then certainly it could not be called Catholick, causally from the Church of Rome.

First,

First, the Church was call'd *Catholick* from the *universal spread* of its *Doctrine*, and the agreement of all particular Churches in it. So *Irenæus* derives the *Unity* of the Church spread abroad over the World from the *Unity* of that *Faith* which was *Universally* received, and from thence saith, *That the Church is but as one House, and having one Soul and Heart, and*

Hanc predicationem cum acceperit, & hanc fidem quemadmodum prædiximus, Ecclesia, & quidem in universum mundum disseminata, diligenter custodit, quasi unam domum inhabitans, & similiter credit eis, videlicet quasi unam animam habens, & unum cor & consonanter hac prædicat & docet & tradit quasi unum possidens os. Irenæus advers. hæres. l. 1. c. 3.

Ecclesia enim per universum orbem usq; ad fines terra disseminata, & ab Apostolis & à discipulis eorum accepit eam fidem, &c. l. 1. c. 2.

Tertullian gives an account of the Churches *Unity*, by the adhering to that *Doctrine* which was first Preached by the Apostles, who having first delivered it in

Statim igitur Apostoli — 1. per Judæam contestatâ fide in Jesum Christum & Ecclesiis institutis; dehinc in orbem profecti, eandem doctrinam ejusdem fidei Nationibus promulgaverunt, & proinde Ecclesiæ apud unamquamq; civitatem condiderunt, à quibus traducem fidei & semina doctrina, ceteræ exinde Ecclesiæ mutuata sunt, & quotidie mutantur ut Ecclesiæ fiant: ac per hoc & ipsæ Apostolica deputantur, ut soboles Apostolicarum Ecclesiarum. Omne genus ad originem suam recenseatur, necesse est. Itaq; tot ac tantæ ecclesiæ, una est illa ab Apostolis prima, ex qua omnes. Sic omnes prima & Apostolica, dum una omnes probant unitatem: dum est illis communicatio pacis, & appellatio fraternitatis, & confederatio hospitalitatis. Tertul. de præscript. hæretic. cap. 20.

Μία ὁμοῦ ἐστὶ κατὰ πᾶσαν γλῶσσαν καὶ διακρίσιν ἐκκλησίαι· διὰ τοῦτο οὐκ ἔστιν ἀλλοτριότης, ἀλλὰ ἀγάπη καὶ ὁμοθυμαδὸν καὶ ὁμοφρονία ἐκκλησίας, ἡ ἀπὸ πνεύματος ἑως πνεύματος ἡ ἐκ κοινῆς πίστεως καὶ ἐκ κοινῆς ἐκκλησίας, καὶ ἐκ κοινῆς πίστεως καὶ ἐκ κοινῆς ἐκκλησίας, καὶ ἐκ κοινῆς πίστεως καὶ ἐκ κοινῆς ἐκκλησίας. Theodoret. in Psal. 47. 4. Tom. 1. p. 580.

Μίαν ἵδ' ἡ καθολικὴ αὐτῆς ἐκκλησίαν βεβύληται, ἥς εἰ καὶ τὰ μέλη εἰς πολλὰς τε καὶ διαφόρους τόπους τὰ μέλη διήρηται, ἀλλ' ὅμως ἐν πνεύματι, καὶ ἐν τῷ δεῖν βεβύληται. Theod. Ecclesi. hist. l. 1. c. 9.

speaks as with one mouth. Nothing can be more plain than that *Irenæus* makes the consent in *Doctrine* to be the ground of *Unity* in the *Catholick Church*. And that he did not suppose this consent to arise from the *Church of Rome*, appears from what he saith before, *That this Faith was received in the Church so universally spread from the Apostles and their Disciples.* Which must be understood of that universal diffusion of it by the first Preachers of it in the World, the continuance of which *Doctrine* was the ground of the *Unity* in the *Catholick Church*. To the same purpose *Tertullian*

gives an account of the Churches *Unity*, by the adhering to that *Doctrine* which was first Preached by the Apostles, who having first delivered it in *Judea* and planted Churches there, went abroad and declared the same to other Nations and settled Churches in Cities, from whence other Churches have the same *Doctrine* propagated to them, which are therefore call'd *Apostolical Churches*, as the off-spring of those which were founded by them. Therefore so many and so great Churches, are all that one prime *Apostolical Church* from whence all others come. And thus they are all prime and *Apostolical* in regard of their *Unity*, as long as there is that communication of Peace, title of Brotherhood, and common mark of Hospitality. Wherein we see, that which made Churches in *Tertullian's* sense *Apostolical*, is the embracing and continuing in that *Doctrine* which was first delivered by the Apostles; and thus Churches though remote from the *Apostolical* times may have the denomination of *Apostolical* from their consent in *Doctrine* with those which were founded by them. But here is not the least intimation of any Centre of Ecclesiastical Communion infusing *Unity* into the *Catholick Church*, for this *Unity* ariseth from that *Doctrine* which was declared in and propagated by all the *Apostolical Churches*. So likewise *Theodoret* speaks, *That there is one Church throughout the World, and therefore we pray, for the Holy, One, Catholick, and Apostolick Church, extended from one end of the Earth to the other.* Which (saith he) is divided by Cities, and Towns, and Villages, so that there are infinite and innumerable Churches in the Islands and Continent, but all these are reduced to one, being united in the agreement of the same true *Doctrine*. So *Constantine* in his Epistle to the Bishops who were absent from the Council of Nice, saith, *That our Saviour would*

have one Catholick Church, whose members though dispersed in many several places, yet are nourished by the same Spirit which is the Will of God. In all which

which and many other places which might be produced to the same purpose, we see a quite different account given of the *unity* of the *Catholick Church*, from that which you mention as the cause of it; we find the Church call'd *Catholick* in regard of its *large extent* in the world (as is apparent besides these testimonies, from the Controversies between *S. Austin* and the *Donatists*) and the *unity* of that *Catholick Church* not placed in the least respect to the *Church of Rome*, but in the *consent* in the *Apostolical Doctrine* in all those Churches which concurred as members to make up this *Catholick Church*. So that the *formal reason* of any particular Churches having the denomination of *Catholick*, must come not from any communion with the *Church of Rome*; but from the *owning* the *Catholick* and *Apostolick Faith*, and joyning in communion with those Churches which did own and acknowledge it. And therefore we find that the *symbol of communion* in the ancient *communicatory letters* never lay in the acknowledgment of *Christ's Vicar on earth*, or communion with the *Church of Rome*, but in such things which were common to all *Apostolical Churches*. And therefore the *Church of Rome* could not be then accounted the *center of Ecclesiastical communion* as you speak, after *Cardinal Perron*, from whom you have *Verbatim* transcribed all your former discourse. This being therefore the utmost which that great wit of your Church was able to plead in behalf of its being the *Catholick Church*, it deserves to be further considered.

Perron's Reply to King James, l. 4. c. 9.

We come therefore to that kind of *unity* in the *Catholick Church* which depends on the *Government* of it; and this is that, which is pretended as the ground of the *Roman Churches* being the *Catholick Church*; because though (as *Cardinal Perron* says) she be in her own Being particular, yet she may be call'd *Catholick* causally, as the center and beginning of *Ecclesiastical Communion* infusing unity, which is the form of universality, into the *Catholick Church*. This therefore must be more narrowly searched into, to see if this were a known and received truth in the ancient Church. Which is so far from it, that we find no such causal influence from the *Church of Rome* then owned or asserted, but that the *Catholick Church* was a whole consisting of *homogeneous parts*, without any such subordination or dependence, as the contrary supposition implies. This is, by none more fully asserted, than by such who have with the greatest zeal and industry stood up for the *unity* of the *Catholick Church*. The first of whom is *St. Cyprian*; in whose time and writings there are very remarkable cases occurring to clear, upon what terms the *unity* of the *Catholick Church* did then stand. The first I begin with, is the case which arose in the Church about the Schism of *Novatianus*, which will give us the fuller discovery of the grounds of *unity* in the *Catholick Church*, because the first rise of this Schism was in *Rome* it self. For *Novatus* coming to *Rome* in a discontent from *Africa*, falls in with *Novatianus* (which two names the *Greek writers* of the Church commonly confound) who being likewise under discontent at the election of *Cornelius* to be *Bishop of Rome*, was ready to joyn with the other in fomenting a Schism. For which they made this their pretext, That *Cornelius* had admitted such to communion who had lapsed in the persecution of *Decius*, which tended to the overthrow of the Churches purity. Upon this *Novatianus* gets himself ordained, by three Bishops, *Bishop of Rome* in opposition to *Cornelius*: the same of which Schism being spread abroad, there was great making of parties on both sides. *Cyprian* and the Churches of *Africa* after full inquiry into it declare for *Cornelius*, so

v. Rigalt. ad Cyp. ep. 49. Petav. ad Epiphan. baref. 59. p. 226. Valef. ad Euseb. l. 6. c. 43, 44. Albapin. de Balduin. in Optat.

did *Dionysius* of *Alexandria* and the Churches there; but *Fabius* of *Antioch* with the Churches of *Pontus* and *Cilicia* suspend, and rather encline to *Novatianus*, for some time; till they were after, more fully satisfied by *Dionysius* of *Alexandria*. Now here is a case wherein the grounds of unity in the *Catholic Church* may be easily discerned, which it is plain from the proceedings in it, where (as in all such emergent cases) what should be determined and agreed on, by the consent of the *Catholic Church*: i. e. of those Churches which all consented in the same *Catholic Faith*, and therefore made up one *Catholic Church*. Now if the Church of *Rome* had been the center of *Ecclesiastical communion*, and had infused *Catholic unity* into the Church at this time, what way or possibility had there been for restoring the Churches unity? Neither was the appeal made to *forraign Churches* meerly because *Rome* it self was divided, and so the Controversie could not be ended there, but it appears from the whole story of the proceedings, that this was looked on as the proper means for preserving the unity of the *Catholic Church*, at that time; when the Faith and communion of the *Apostolical Churches* were so fully known and distinguished from all others. These things will more fully appear from *S. Cyprians* Epistle to *Antonianus* upon the occasion of this Schism. Who it seems at first adhered to *Cornelius* and with him to the *Catholic Church*, (not as tho' his joyning with *Cornelius* was the cause of his being with the *Catholic Church*, but because in joyning with him he joyn'd with the *Catholic Church*, which declared for him;) but it seems afterwards by some Letters of *Novatianus* he began to stagger, and desires *Cyprian* to give him an account what Heresie *Novatianus* broached, and what the reason was why *Cornelius* communicated with the lapsed persons. As to which particulars he endeavours to satisfy him, and withal to give an account why they joyned with *Cornelius* in opposition to *Novatianus*, and what the practice of the Church was, as to lapsed persons, and on what reasons it was built: wherein he tells him, That tho' some of their own Bishops had formerly denied communion to lapsed persons, yet they did not recede from the Unity of the *Catholic Church*, or communion of the Fellowships, because by them

Cyprian.
ep. 52. ed.
Rigalt.

*Manente concordia vinculo, & perseverante
Catholica Ecclesia individuo sacramento,
actum suum disponit ac dirigit unusquisq;
episcopus, rationem propositi sui Domino
redditurus.* *Cyprian.* ep. 52,

they were admitted. For, saith he, the bond of concord remaining, and the communion of the *Catholic Church* continuing, every Bishop orders and disposeth his own actions as one that must give an account of his design to God. Doth *S. Cyprian* here speak like one that be-

lieved the Church of *Rome* to be the center of *Ecclesiastical communion*? or that the unity of the Church lay in acknowledging the Pope to be *Christ's Vicar*, or in dependence on the Church of *Rome*? when every Bishop is left to himself and God, in all such things which he may do, and yet hold communion with the *Catholic Church*. And therefore afterwards he tells us, That there

*Cum sit à Christo una Ecclesia per totum
mundum in multa membra divisa: item E-
piscopatus unus, Episcoporum multorum con-
cordi numerositate diffusus.* *Id.* ib. p. 81.

is one Church divided into many members throughout the world, and one episcopal office spread abroad, by the consenting multitude of many Bishops. If this Church be

one in this sense, and the whole Government of the Church be but as one Bishoprick, as all the Bishops unanimously consent in the management of it; then here is not the least foundation for the *Catholic Churches* taking its denomination causally from the *Roman Church*, and much less for the Bishops having dependence on her, or relation to her. Since the care and government of the Church by these words of *Cyprian* appears to be equally committed to all the Bishops of the *Catholic Church*. And from thence it was, that in this Epistle we read that *S. Cyprian* writ to the Church of *Rome* after the death of *Fabianus*, to advise them what to do in the case of

lapsed

lapsed persons, which letters of his were sent through the world; which, *Rigaltius* well observes, did arise from that unity of Ecclesiastical discipline, whereby *Cyprian*, not doubting but the care of all Churches was upon him, dispatched these Letters to the Clergy at Rome; from whence they were sent through the Catholick Church, as an evidence that there was but one Episcopal office in the whole Church, part of which was committed in full power to every Bishop. Thus we see a quite different account given of the unity of the Catholick Church than what you from *Cardinal Perron* would perswade us of. It being an easie matter for Men of wit and parts (especially such as that great Cardinal was master of) to coyn distinctions to make the most absurd things seem plausible; but yet when they come to be examined, they are found to have no other bottom but the invention of that person who coyned them.

And that it is so as to this distinction of the formal, causal, and participative Catholick Church, will be further evident from another case which happened in *S. Cyprian's* time, which was this. *Felicissimus* and *Fortunatus* being cast out of communion by a Synod of African Bishops, when they saw they could do little good in Africa, run over to Rome, and bring letters to *Cornelius* the Bishop there, misrepresenting the whole business of their being ejected out of the Church, on purpose to perswade *Cornelius* to admit them into communion. Who at first being unwilling to hearken to them, was at last by their threats and menaces brought to receive their letters. Upon which *S. Cyprian* writes an Epistle to *Cornelius*, wherein he tells him, That if the threats of such profligate persons should relax the Churches discipline, all the power and strength of it would be soon taken away; that the ground of all Schism and Heresie arises from Disobedience to the Bishop. Certainly he doth not mean the Bishop of Rome, but every Bishop in the Catholick Church (for it was not *Cornelius* but *Cyprian* and the African Bishops who were disobeyed) upon which he falls upon the matter of their appeal to a forraign Church, and after some fair commendations of the Church of Rome (the meaning of which will be afterwards examined) he very sharply condemns these appeals to forraign Churches as unreasonable, unjust, and dishonourable to those Bishops, whose sentence they appealed from. For, What cause (saith he) could these persons have of coming and declaring against their Bishops? For either they are pleased in what they have done, and continue in their wickedness; or if they are displeased at it and recede from it, they know whither to return. For since it is decreed by us all, and it is a thing just and reasonable in it self, that every ones cause be heard where the fault was committed, and every Pastour hath a part of the flock committed to him, which he is to rule and govern as being to give an account of it to God; it is requisite that those whom we rule over, ought not to run about, and break the concord of Bishops by their headiness and subtilty; but there to defend their cause, where they may have accusers and witnesses of their faults. Unless it be, that to a few desperate and profligate persons the authority of the Bishops of Africa seems less to them, who have already sat in judgement upon them, and solemnly condemned them lately for their crimes.

Itaq; ex unitatis Ecclesiasticæ disciplinâ, Cyprianus sollicitudinem omnium Ecclesiarum ad se pertinere non ambicens, etiam Romanæ se dedisse literas ait ad clerum. Has verò literas per totum mundum missas, h. e. per Ecclesiam Catholicam, cuius Ecclesia unus est Episcopatus, atq; huiusmodi Episcopatus à singulis Episcopis in solidum pars tenebatur, Rigalt. observ. ad Cypr. p. 64.

Qua autem causa veniendi & pseudo-episcoporum contra Episcopos factum nunciandi? Aut enim placet illis quod fecerunt, & in suo scelere perseverant: Aut, si displicet & recedunt, sciunt quò revertantur. Nam cum statutum sit omnibus nobis, & æquum sit pariter ac iustum, ut unusquisq; causa illuc audiat, ubi est crimen admissum, & singulis pastoribus portio gregis sit adscripta, quam regat unusquisq; & gubernet, rationem sui actûs Domino redditurus: oportet utiq; eos quibus præsumus non circumcursare nec Episcoporum concordiam coherentem suâ subdola & fallaci temeritate collidere, sed agere illic causam suam, ubi & accusatores habere & testes sui criminis possint: nisi si paucis desperatis & perditis minor videtur esse auctoritas Episcoporum in Africâ constitutorum, qui jam de illis iudicaverunt, & eorum conscientiam multis delictorum laqueis vinciam iudicii sui nuper gravitate damnarunt. Cyprian. ep. 55. p. 95.

De Unitate
Eccles. p.
208.

Can any thing be more express and punctual than this testimony of Cyprian is, to overthrow that sense of the *Catholick Church* which you contend for? How far were Cyprian and the *African Bishops* from making *Rome* the center of *Ecclesiastical communion*, when they looked on appeals thither as *very unjust and unreasonable*? What acknowledgement and dependence was there on the *Church of Rome* in those who looked on themselves as having a portion of *Christ's flock* committed to them, of which they were to give an account to God alone? And I pray what excellent persons were those who undervalued the Authority of the *African Bishops*, and ran to *Rome*? S. Cyprian tells us, they were *pauci, desperati, perdit*, and translate these with as much advantage to your cause as you can. So fatal hath it been to *Rome* even from its first foundation to be a receptacle for such persons. And is not this a great credit to your cause, that such persons who were ejected out of communion for their crimes at home, did make their resort to *Rome*? and the more pious and stout any Bishops were, the more they defend their own privileges in opposition to the encroachments of the *Roman See*. Which was apt to take advantage from such Renegado's as these were, by degrees to get more power into her hands, and lift up her head above her fellow-Churches. But lest you should think that S. Cyprian only spake these things in an heat, out of his opposition to these persons and his desire to crush them, you shall see what his judgement was concerning the same things when he purposely discourseth of them. For in his Book of the *Unity of the Church*, he useth that expression which destroys all your subordinate union in the Church; which is, *Episcopatus unus est, cujus à singulis in solidum pars tenetur*. They who consider and understand the importance of that speech, will find nothing more destructive to your doctrine of the *Catholick Church* than that is. For when he makes the *Universal Government* of the Church to be but one *Episcopal* office, and that committed in the several parts of it with full power to particular Bishops, can any be so senseless to imagine that he should ever think the *Government* of the Church in General to depend on any one particular Church as chief over the rest? And that the former words do really import such a full power in particular Bishops, over that part of the flock which is committed to them, appears from the true importance of the phrase *in solidum*; a phrase taken out of the *Civil Law*, where great difference is made between an obligation *in partem* and *in solidum*, and so proportionable between a tenure *in partem* and *in solidum*: those things were held *in solidum* which were held in full right and power without payments and acknowledgments: but where the *usus fructus* belonged to another, it was not held *in solidum*. So that when S. Cyprian saith, that every part belonging to each Bishop was held *in solidum*, he therein imports that full right and power which every Bishop hath over his charge; and in this speech he compares the *Government* of the Church to an estate held by several *Freeholders*, in which every one hath a full right to that share which belongs to him. Whereas according to your principles the *Government* of the Church is like a *Manor* or *Lordship*, in which the several inhabitants hold at the best but by Copy from the Lord; and you would fain have it at the will of your Lord too. But thus far we see S. Cyprian was from your modern notion of the *Catholick Church*, that he looks on the *Unity* of it as depending

on the consent of the *Catholick Bishops and Churches* under their full power, and not deriving that *Unity* from any particular Church as the *Head and Fountain* of it. And therefore in the former *Schism* at *Rome* about *Cornelius* and *Novatianus*, *St. Cyprian* implored two of his *Colleagues* thither, *Caldonius* and *Fortunatus*, that not only by the *Letters* they carried, but by their presence and *Counsel* they should do their utmost endeavour to bring the *Members* of that divided Body to the *Unity* of the *Catholick Church*.

Ut ad Catholica Ecclesia unitatem scissi corporis membra componerent. Cypri. ep. 42.

Which is certainly a very different thing from the *Catholick Church's* deriving its *Unity* from the particular Church of *Rome*. Many other Instances of a like nature might be produced out of the *Reports* of *St. Cyprian's* time, but these are sufficient to evidence how far the *Unity* of the *Catholick Church* was then from depending on the Church of *Rome*.

But, lest we should seem to insist only on *St. Cyprian's* Testimony, it were easie to multiply examples in this kind; which I shall but touch at some of, and proceed. If the Church of *Rome* then had been looked on as the Center of *Ecclesiastical Communion*, is it possible to conceive that the *Excommunications* of the Church of *Rome* should be slighted

§. 101

as they were by *Polycrates*, for which *St. Hierom* commends him, as a Man of courage? That *Stephen*

Eusebius *hisor. Ecclesiastic. lib. 5. cap. 24.*
Hieron. de scriptor. Ecclesiast. To. 1.

should be opposed as he was by *Cyprian* and *Firmilian* in a way so reflecting on the *Authority* of the *Roman Church*? That *Appeals* to *Rome* should be so severely prohibited by the *African Bishops*? That *Causes* should be determined by so many *Canons* to be heard in their proper *Dioceses*? That, when the right of *Appeals* was challenged by the *Bishops* of *Rome*, it was wholly upon the account of the imaginary *Nicene Canon*? That, when *Julius* undertook by his sole Power to absolve *Athanasius*, the *Oriental Bishops* opposed it as irregular on that account, at the *Council* at *Antioch*? That, when afterwards, *Paulus*, *Marcellus*, and *Lucius* repaired to *Rome* to *Julius*, and he seeks to restore them, the *Eastern Bishops* wonder at his offering to restore them who were excommunicated by themselves? And

Socrat. l.

2. c. 5.

Socrat. l. 3.

c. 5.

Socrat. l.

2. c. 11.

that as when *Novatus* was excommunicated at *Rome* they opposed it not, so neither ought he to oppose their proceedings against these Persons. What account can be given of these passages, if the *Unity* of the *Catholick Church* had depended on the particular Church of *Rome*? Besides, while the Church of *Rome* continued regular, we find she looked on her self as much obliged to observe the *Excommunications* made by other Churches, as others were to observe hers. As in the case of *Marcion*, who being excommunicated by his Father the *Bishop* of *Sinope* in *Pontus*, and by no means prevailing with his Father for his admission into the Church again; resorts to *Rome*, and with great earnestness begs Admission there, where he received this answer; That they could not do

it without the command of his Father; for there is one Faith and one Consent, and we cannot contradict our worthy Brother, your Father. This shews the *Unity* of the *Catholick Church* to proceed upon other grounds than the causal influence of the Church of *Rome*, when the consent of the

Church did oblige the Church of *Rome*, not to repeal the *Excommunication* of a particular *Bishop*. Upon which ground it was, that *Synesius* proceeded so high in the *Letters* of *Excommunication* against *Andronicus*;

that

Ὁυ δύναμεθα ἀπὸ τῆ ἐπισκοπῆς τῆς
ἡμῶν πατρὸς οὗ τῆτο προέσκειν μίαν
γὰρ ἐστὶν ἡ πίστις, μία ἡ ἐκκλήσια, καὶ ἡ
δύναμις ἐκκλησιαστικὴ τῆς καλῆς
συνελευσεως, πατρὶ δὲ σφ. *Epiphanius*
hæref. 42. Sect. 1.

Ἐὰν δὲ τις ὡς μικροπολίτην ἀποκυβερ-
λίσει τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, καὶ ἀξέται τὰς
ἀποκηρύξεις αὐτῆς, ὡς ἐκ ἀνάγκης τῆς πό-
λεως πείθεσθαι, ἵσχυρος τὴν ἐκκλη-
σίαν, ἢν μίαν ὁ Χριστὸς ἱδρύεται.
Synes. epist. 58. p. 203. ed. Pe-
tav.

that he forbids *all the Churches upon Earth* to receive him into their Communion. And withal adds, *That if any should condemn his Church because it was of a little City, and should receive those who were condemned by it, as though it were not necessary to obey so poor a Church; he lets them know that they make a Schism in that Church which Christ would have to be one.* We see here, on what equal terms the Communion of the *Catholick Church* then stood: When so small

a Church as that of *Ptolemais* could so far oblige by her act the *Catholick Church* that they should be guilty of *Schism* who admitted them to Communion whom she had cast out of it. If *Synesius* had believed the *Church of Rome* to have been the *Center of Ecclesiastical Communion*, had it not been good *Manners*, nay *Duty* in him to have asked first the pleasure of the *Church of Rome* in this case, before he had passed so full and definitive a Sentence as this was? But the wise and great Men of those Ages were utterly strangers to these rare distinctions of a *causal*, *formal*, and *participative Catholick Church*. It is true indeed they did then speak honourably of the *Church of Rome* in their Age as a principal Member of the *Catholick Church*, and having advantages above other Churches by its being fixed in the *Seat of the Empire*, on which account her Communion was much desired by other Persons. But still we find the Persons most apt to extol her Authority were such as were most *obnoxious*, who not being able to hold any reputation in their own Churches, where their Crimes and Scandals were sufficiently known, ran presently to *Rome*, which was ready still to take their part, thereby to inhance her power: As is most evident in the many disputes which arose upon such accounts between the *Roman and African Bishops*. But these things we shall have occasion to discuss more particularly afterwards. At the present it may be sufficient by these few (of very many examples which might be produced) to have made it appear, that it was far from being a known and received truth in the ancient Church, that the *Church of Rome* was the center of *Ecclesiastical Communion*, or that the Church was call'd *Catholick* from the union with her, and dependence upon her.

S. 11. But we must now consider what strenuous proofs you produce for so confident an affirmation: Your instances therefore being the most pregnant to your purpose which you could find in *Antiquity* must be particularly examined: Your first is of *St. Ambrose*, relating that his Brother *Satyrus* going on shore in a certain City of *Sardinia* (where he desired to be Baptized) demanded of the Bishop of that City whether he consented with the *Catholick Bishops*, that is (saith he) with the *Roman Church*. These words I grant to be in *St. Ambrose*, but whosoever thoroughly considers them will find how little they make for your purpose. For

Advocavit ad se Episcopum loci, percontatusque est, utrumnam cum Episcopis Catholicis, hoc est, cum Romana Ecclesia conveniret. D. Ambros. orat. in obit. frat.

which it will be sufficient to look on the following words, which tell us, that at that time there

Et forte & ad id locorum in Schismate regionis illius ecclesia erat. Lucifer enim se a nostrâ tunc temporis communione diviserat, & quanquam pro fide exulasset, & fidei suæ reliquisset hæredes, non putavit tam fidem esse in Schismate. Id. lb.

was a *Schism* in the Church, and *Sardinia* was the chief seat of it. For *Lucifer Carlitanus* had newly separated himself from the Church, and had left Societies there which joyned in his *Schism*. For *Caralis* was the Metropolis of *Sardinia*, and it appears by *St. Hierome*, that the *Luciferians* confined the Church only to *Sardinia*, which is the cause of that expression of his; That

That Christ did not come meerly for the sake of the Sardinians. So that those *Luciferians* were much like the *Donatists*, confining the Church only to their own number. Now there being such a *Schism* at that time in *Sardinia*, what did *Satyrus* any more than enquire whether the *Bishop* of the place he resorted to was guilty of this *Schism* or no? But (say you) he made that the tryal whether he was a *Catholick* or no, by asking whether he agreed with the Church of *Rome*. To which I answer, that there was very great reason for his particular instancing in the Church of *Rome*. 1. Because *Satyrus* was originally of the Church of *Rome* himself; for *Paulinus* in the Life of *St. Ambrose*, (*Satyrus* his Brother) speaking of him after his Consecration to be *Bishop*, says, *Ad urbem Romam, hoc est ad natale solum perrexit*. He went to *Rome*, i. e. to the place of his birth; now *Satyrus* being originally a *Roman*, what wonder is it that he should particularly enquire of the *Roman Church*? As suppose one of the *Gallican Church* of *Arles* or *Vienna* should have been cast upon shore in another *Island* belonging to *France* at the same time, and understanding there was a *Schism* in the place, should particularly enquire whether they agreed with the *Catholick Bishops*, i. e. with the Church of *Arles* or *Vienna*. Could you hence infer that either of these were the Center of Ecclesiastical Communion, and if not from hence, how can you from the other? Or suppose, in the time of the *Donatists Schism* in *Africk*, a stranger coming accidentally thither and desiring Communion with the Christians of that City he was in, should enquire of the *Bishop* of the City whether he communicated with the *Catholick Bishops*, i. e. with the Church of *Hippo* or *Carthage*. Could you hence infer that *Hippo* was causally the *Catholick Church*, and if not, with what reason can you do it from so parallel a case? 2. Because *Sardinia* did belong to the *Metropolitan Province* of the Church of *Rome*; it being one of the *Suburbicarian Provinces* under the jurisdiction of the *Roman Lieutenant*, and consequently one of the *Suburbicarian Churches* appertaining to the *Metropolitan Power* of the *Bishop of Rome*: And therefore it was but reason to ask whether the Churches in *Sardinia* did agree with their Mother Church or no. But all this is very far from implying that the *Unity* of the *Catholick Church* comes from the particular Church of *Rome*: On this account, because at that time when the *Unity* of the *Catholick Church* was preserved by that continual Correspondence between the parts of it by the formed letters and otherwise, whoever was known to have Communion with any one particular Church (which Communicated with the rest) had thereby Communion with the *Catholick Church*. So that on that account the question might as well have been asked of the Churches of *Milan*, *Agobio*, or any other in *Italy* as of the Church of *Rome*. For whosoever communicated with any of them did communicate with the *Catholick Church*, as well as those who did communicate with the Church of *Rome*. So that your first instance will prove no more the Church of *Rome* to be the fountain and center of Ecclesiastical Communion, than any other particular Church. Your second is, from *St. Hierom's* saying, That the Church of *Alexandria* made it her glory to participate of the *Roman Faith*. But doth it hence follow that the Church of *Alexandria* was therefore *Catholick*, because she participated of the Faith of the *Roman Church* considered as a particular Church? For, any one who reads that *Epistle* will easily see, that *St. Hierom* there speaks of the *Roman Faith*, not as it proceeds from the *Roman Church*, but as it was received by it; and that he doth not understand it of the then present Ro-

Nec ob Sardorum tantum Mastrucam Dei Filium descendisse. Hieron. c. Lucifer. init. Mastruca vestis Barbarica genus, quam Sardi sua lingua Mastrucam appellant: Significans multos adhuc superesse bonos Christianos, etiamsi nulli essent in Sardinia, in qua sola ille Christi ecclesiam esse volebat. Erasmus in Scholiis.

Sed tu scito, &c. Romanam fidem Apostolico ore laudatam, cujus se esse participem Alexandrina Ecclesia gloriatur. Hieron. ep. 68. ad Theophil.

man Faith, any further than it agreed with that Faith which the Apostle commended in them. So that the utmost which can be extracted out of this Testimony, is, that it was the glory of the Church of Alexandria to hold the same Faith which the Primitive Roman Church did, for which the Apostle commended it. Which is apparent by the design of the whole Epistle, which is to encourage Theophilus the Patriarch of Alexandria to suppress the Nefarious Heresie (as he calls it) of the Origenists; for, it seems, Theophilus then dealt more mildly with them, which Hierom was displeased at. And therefore tells him, that although he took some care by the discipline of the Church to reduce them, yet that was not enough, and thence brings

Sed tamen scito, nobis nihil esse antiquius quam Christi jura servare, nec patrum transire terminos, semperque meminisse Romanam fidem Apostolico ore laudatam, cujus se esse participem Alexandrina Ecclesia gloriatur. Hieron. Theoph. Tom. 2. p. 110. ed. Chevall. 1533.

in these words; But withal know, that nothing is more our design than to preserve the Rights of Christ, and not to transgress the bounds of our Fathers, and always to remember the Roman Faith, commended by the mouth of the Apostle, which is the glory of the Church of Alexandria that she is a partaker of. If you had dealt so fairly as to have cited St. Hierom's words at large, any one might

easily see how remote they were from your purpose; it being manifest by them, that St. Hierom's only design was; To perswade Theophilus to assert the ancient Faith against the incroachments of modern Heresies; and, to encourage him to it, mentions that commendation which was given to the ancient Faith by the Apostle writing to the Romans upon their receiving it; and therefore since the same Faith was in the Church of Alexandria which the Romans were commended for receiving of, Theophilus ought to be a vigorous assertor of it, against the oppositions of Hereticks. But how from hence we should infer that the Church of Rome was the fountain of Faith as well as center of Communion, is a thing we are yet to seek for, till you further direct us. Yet, it may be, the strength of it lies in this, That the Roman Faith was commended by the Apostle. And was not the Faith of other Churches where it was pure, commended as well as that? And although the Fathers in their complemental addresses to the Church of Rome were pleased often to mention this, That the Roman Faith was praised by the

Sic omnes fere Latini Patres, Pauli ad Romanos verba acceperunt, quasi rectior & sincerior fuisset apud Romanos fides: cum hoc tantum dicat Apostolus; agere se gratias Deo, quod ubique possum fama sit, etiam Romanos verum Dominos, fidem Christianam suscepisse. Quid certe ob dignitatem Urbis quæ totius orbis erat caput & gentium Domina, valde ad fidei Christianæ propagationem conducebat. Rigaltius Observat. ad Cyprian. epist. p. 78.

Apostle; yet, as Rigaltius well observes, That the Latin Fathers took those words of the Apostle, as though their Faith were more pure and sincere than in other places; whereas the Apostle only saith, that he gave thanks to God that there was such a fame abroad, that the Romans who swayed the World, had embraced the Christian Faith. Which by reason of the dignity of the City which was head of the World, and empress of Nations, did conduce much to the propagation of the Christian Faith. For that there was no peculiar excellency in the Roman Faith above

the Faith of other Churches, appears from the scope of this Epistle which was to instruct and settle them in the right Faith, and from the Testimonies of the Author of the Commentaries under St. Ambrose's name, and St. Hierom himself. The former tells us, the reason why St. Paul commended their Faith, was Because though they saw no miracles yet they believed, though not so purely as they ought to have done. And afterwards saith, That St. Paul commends their Faith although it were not exact according to rule, yet since by that they came to worship God in Christ he rejoiceth in it, knowing they might increase more in it. And St. Hierom elsewhere speaking without design or interest,

Quia nulla vitutum viridentes insignia, susceperunt fidem Christi, quamvis corrupto sensu. Ambros. præfat. in epist. ad Roman.

Quamvis non secundum regulam ab autoribus tradita veritatis, tamen quia quod ab uno Deo erat, interposito nomine Christi, cuperant venerari, gratulatur; sciens illos posse proficere. Id. ad. v. 8. c. 1.

rest,

rest faith, *Not that the Romans have any other kind of Faith than what all other Churches have; but that there was greater devotion and simplicity in believing.* And withall adds, that the very same faults which the *Apostles* condemned them for then, did continue still among them, the greatest of which was *Pride*. And if this present Controversie do not make good S. Hieron's observation till this time, we are strangely mistaken: for what greater *Pride* can there be, than for any particular Church to arrogate the title of *Catholick* to her self, and to make all others no farther *Catholick* than they participate of her Faith and Communion?

Non quod aliam habeant Romani fidem, nisi hanc quam omnes Christi Ecclesie: sed quod devotio in eis major sit et simplicitas ad credendum. Hieron. præfat. in l. 2. comment. in epist. ad Galat. Tom. 9.

Your next Testimony is that of *John*, the Patriarch of Constantinople, who did in his Epistle to *Hormisda*, judge those to be severed from the communion of the Catholick Church, who did not consent in all things with the See Apostolick: but the main force of your testimonies lies in a presumption that Men will never take the pains to examine them. We must therefore consider the occasion and manner of the writing this Epistle; for those words you cite, are not the words of the Patriarch himself, but of the form of subscription required by *Hormisda* in order to an Union of the Eastern and Western Churches; which had been then a long time in a Schism. For after that *Acacius* stood up so resolutely in defence of the rights of his See at Constantinople, the Roman Bishops (who made it then their design to infringe the liberties of other Churches the better to enhance their own) would by no means admit of any reconciliation, unless the names of *Acacius*, and those who defended him in that See being his Successors, as *Phravita*, *Euphemius*, *Macedonius*, &c. were expunged out of the Diptychs of the Church; which being so unjust and unreasonable a demand, for a long time the Patriarchs of Constantinople would by no means assent to it. But after the death of the Emperour *Anastasius*, *Justine* succeeds in the throne, one who made it his business to have this breach made up; in order to which he writes to *Hormisda*, and earnestly perswades him to a reconciliation; and so likewise doth the Patriarch *John*. But it hath been the common practice of the Bishops of that Church, to be therein unlike the unjust Judge, that they will not be wrought on by importunities; but have been the more implacable, the more they have been sought to: as it appeared in this present case. For this soure and inflexible Pope would not yield to any terms of Union, but upon conditions of his own prescribing, which were, the expunging of *Acacius*, and subscribing that form which he sent to them. Which when the Emperor and Patriarch saw, though they were sufficiently displeased at it, yet out of their greedy desire of peace, they were contented rather to swallow these hard conditions than suffer the Schism to remain still. Now it is in this form of subscription that these words are contained, wherein they promise, not to recite the names of those in the sacred mysteries, who were severed from the communion of the Catholick Church, i. e. who consent not in all things with the See Apostolick. But lest these words being thus inserted by the Pope himself, should be interpreted to the disadvantage of other Churches, and particularly that of Constantinople; The Patriarch makes a Preface to that Subscription by way of Protestation; wherein after declaring the reception of the Pope's letters, and congratulating the hopes of Union, he manifests his own desire of peace, and his willingness to refuse the communion of

S. 12.
Concil. Tom.
3. p. 767.

all Hereticks. For, saith he, I look on those most holy Churches of your elder and our new Rome, as both making but one Church. And af-

Sanctissimas enim Dei Ecclesias, i. e. superiores vestras, & novella istius Romae unam esse accipio, illam sedem Apostoli Petri, & illius Augusta civitatis unam esse desinno.
Joh. Patriarch. ep. inter ep. Hormisd. 35.

ter, declaring his assent to the degrees of the four General Councils, he adds, That those who opposed them be judged fallen off, à Sanctâ Dei generali & Apostolicâ Ecclesiâ, from the holy Catholick and Apostolick Church.

Now when the Patriarch was thus careful to explain himself, so as to assert that the Church of Rome, and that of Constantinople, made but one Church, when he adds what he means by the Catholick Church, viz. the truly General and Apostolical Church; infer as much from Hormisdâ's words as you will, I am sure you can do little to your purpose from the Patriarchs, taking them in the sense he explains himself in, by this Protestation. So that the meaning of them is only this, that as he judged the Church of Rome a member of the Catholick Church (whose Unity required, that those who were out of communion in one Church should be so with the rest) so he consented to acknowledge them justly excommunicated whom the Church of Rome would have to be so. So that hence nothing ariseth to your purpose, more than will equally advance the authority of any other particular Church; whose excommunications did oblige the whole Church, as we have seen already in the case of Sinope and Ptolemais.

S. 13.

You proceed to another Testimony of S. Austin addressing himself to the

Numerate sacerdotes vel ab ipsâ sede Petri & in ordine illo Patrum quis cui successit videre. Ipsa est Petra quam non vincunt superba Inferorum Porta. D. Aug. in Psalm. C. part. Donat. Tom. 7. col. 9.

Donatists, telling them, That the succession of the Roman Bishops is the rock which the proud gates of Hell overcome not, thereby insinuating, that the very succession of those Bishops is in some true sense the Catholick Church.

But from whence doth it appear that the succession of the Roman Bishops is the Rock here spoken of? For S. Austin was there arguing against the Donatists and shewing them the danger of being separated from the unity of the Catholick Church; that if they were cut off from the vine, they would wither and be in danger to be cast into the fire; and therefore

Venite fratres, si vultis ut inseramini in vite: Dolor est cum vos videmus præciosos ita jacere.

exhorts them, to come and be planted into the vine, it being a grief to them to see them cut off. Now in order to this, he brings in the former words to acquaint them

with the way, whereby they might better understand the Catholick Church, which could not in reason be confined to their own age, but must be derived from the Apostles. So that his counsel is of the same nature with that of Tertullian and Irenæus, who put Men upon a diligent search into the successions of the Apostolical Churches. But now when by this search they have found out the Catholick Church, he tells them, That is the Rock which the proud gates of Hell cannot overcome. For so elsewhere S. Austin calls the Catholick Church a Rock, as he calls it likewise a House, and a City, in several places of these disputations against the Donatists. As here before he calls

August. de baptis. c. Donatist. l. 3. c. 18. l. 4. c. 12. l. 7. c. 51. Advers. Petilian. l. 2. c. 70. De unitat. Eccles. cap. 20.

it the Vine, from whence all who are cut off, wither and dye: But what is all this to the particular Church of Rome: which none of the Disputes with the Donatists at all concerned? As is fully manifest from the

whole management of that Controversie; in which tho' he was so much put upon shewing what and where the Catholick Church was, yet he never once expressed any such thing, as that the Church was called Catholick from any relation to the Church of Rome, but still mentions it as a particular Church, which with other Churches made up one Catholick Church. So in his

Commens-

Commentaries on the 44th Psalm: Behold Rome, saith he, behold Carthage, behold several other Cities; these are Kings daughters and have delighted the King in his honour, but they all make up but one Queen. How incongruous had this expression been, had S. Austin believed the *Roman Church* to be so much above all others, that the ground why any others were called *Catholick*, was from their union with her; and therefore he must according to your principles have saluted the *Church of Rome* as the *Queen* of all the rest, and made other particular Churches but as her daughters and hand-maids. But S. Austin knew of no such difference, but looked on all particular Churches, whether at *Rome*, *Carthage* or elsewhere, as making up but one *Catholick Church*. And to the same purpose he frequently speaks, when he saies, *That the Church is call'd One in regard of her Unity, and Many in regard of the several Societies of Christians abroad in the world*; When he calls the several Churches, members of that one Church which is spread all over the world, without setting any note of discrimination upon one above all the rest; When he reckons the *Roman*, *Corinthian*, *Galatian*, *Ephesian Churches* together, and that all these and the Churches propagated from them, do conspire in one *Universal Church*. But the places are so many to this purpose in him, that it would look too much like ostentation to offer to prove a matter so evident to all that read any thing in him. And is it possible then for you to think *That S. Austin made the succession of Bishops at Rome in any sense the Catholick Church*? You might as well say, that he made the Church spread all over the world a particular Church, as that he made any particular Church whether at *Rome* or elsewhere (for he makes no difference) to be in any sense the *Universal Church*.

But that which you seem to lay the greatest force on, is the testimony of *Optatus Milevitanus*, Who, say you, after he had said that S. Peter was head of all the Apostles; and that he would have been a Schismatick, who should have erected another chair against that singular one of S. Peter, as also that in that chair of S. Peter being but one, Unity was to be kept by all; he adds that with Siricius then Pope he himself was united in communion, with whom the whole world (saith he, meaning the whole Catholick Church) agrees by communicatory letters in one Society of communion; See here (say you) how clearly he makes the union with the Bishop of Rome the measure of the Catholick Church; which the Bishop calls a Jesuitism, and further proves himself to be in the Catholick Church, because he was in communion with the See of S. Peter. For our better understanding the meaning of these words of *Optatus*, we must consider the state of the Controversie between *Optatus* and *Parmenianus*, by which it will appear, how very little these words of his make to your purpose. The main question between the *Catholicks* and the *Donatists* was, about the *Catholick Church*, To whom it was that title did belong. The difficulty seemed the greater, because there was no difference between them in any matter of Faith, or in the substance of the Sacraments, and therefore they were fain to find out other means to decide this Controversie, than by either of those two. For which the *Catholicks* made choice of these two arguments *Universality* and *Succession*, the former as agreeing with that large spread of the Church which was Prophesied to be in the times of the Gospel, whereas the *Donatists* confined the Church to a Corner in Africa:

Ecce Roma, ecce Carthago, ecce alia & alia civitates: filia Regum sunt, & delectaverunt Regem suum in bono ipsius; & ex omnibus fit una quadam Regina. Aug. in Pl. 44. p. 282. ed. Froben.

Propter unitatem Ecclesie, una Ecclesia; propter congregationes fraternas per loca multa sunt Ecclesie. Id. in Plal. 141. *An placet vobis, ut contra Ecclesias quae membra sunt unius Ecclesie toto orbe diffuse, &c.* Id. de Unitat. Eccles. c. 11. *Verum etiam illas Ecclesias suas in Scripturis Apostolicis & Canonicis pariter legimus non solum Romanorum, verum etiam Corinthiorum, Galatarum, Ephesiorum, &c.* Ut taceam de aliis tam latis atq; universis terrarum partibus, in quas ex his Apostolicis laboribus & plantationibus porrecta crevit, & crescit Ecclesia Id. c. Crescon. Grammat. l. 2. c. 37.

S. 14.)
Ibid.

the latter in regard of the necessity of deriving themselves from the *Apostolical Churches*. Now the *Donatists* denying any but themselves to be the *Catholick Church*, the proof lay on their *Adversaries* part, who upon all occasions offer to make it good, That the *Church* from which the *Donatists* separated themselves, was the only *true* and *Catholick Church*. Accordingly *Optatus* having in the first book discussed the matters of *fact* about the rise of the *Schism*, the ordinations of *Cecilian* and *Majorinus*, and the proceedings used for the ending the *Schism*, in this second Book, he enters on the Controversie of the *Church* which *Parmenianus* would have to be only among themselves; against which he urgeth first, that then certainly the *Church* could not be called *Catholick*, because it was so called *from its large*

Ubi ergo erit proprietas Catholici nominis, cum inde dicta sit Catholica, quod sit rationabilis & ubique diffusa? Optat. l. 2.

comprehension and universal spread. Had *Optatus* believed the ground of the *Churches* being *Catholick* had been its union with the *Church* of *Rome*, he

would never have given that account of its being called so, which here he doth. After which he produceth many places of *Scripture* to prove the large extent of the *Church*; and concludes, That to be the *Catholick Church* which was diffused over all the world, than which nothing can be more contrary to your pretensions, who limit and confine the *Catholick Church* to your own party as the *Donatists* did. And if those arguments then used against the *Donatists* had any force against them, they have still as much against you, who exclude so great and considerable *Churches* from being members of the *Catholick Church* because not of your communion. From hence *Optatus* proceeds to examine, Which had the better title to be the *Catholick Church* on the account of *Succession*; and *Parmenianus* reckoning the *Cathedra* in the first of the *notes Ecclesie*, *Optatus* begins with that by which is understood the lawful derivation of power for governing the *Church*, so *Albaspineus*, (as well as others) understands it. Now the

Cathedram Episcopalem, primam missionem, omnem potestatem, à qua cetera deducerentur. Albaspineus in Optat. lib. 2.

Controversie was, where this *Cathedra* was. *Optatus* proves, there can be no lawful power but what is derived from the *Apostles*, and therefore where the *succession* is plain and uninterrupted, there and no where else

can that *Cathedra* be. Which *Episcopal chair* being first placed at *Rome* by *S. Peter*, in which he as chief of the *Apostles* sate, from whence he had his name *Cephas*; in which one chair *Unity* should be kept by all; lest the other

Igitur negare non potes, scire te in urbe Romæ Petro primo Cathedram Episcopalem esse collatam; in qua sederit omnium Apostolorum caput Petrus; inde & cephas appellatus est; in qua una Cathedra, unitas ab omnibus servaretur, nè ceteri Apostoli singulas sibi quisque defenderent: ut jam Schismaticus & peccator esset, qui contra singularem Cathedram, alteram collocaret. Ergo Cathedra unica qua est prima de dotibus, sedit prior Petrus: Cui successit Linus, Lino Clemens, &c. Damasus Siricius bodie, qui noster est Socius: Cum quo totus orbis commercio formatarum in una communionis societate concordat. Vestra Cathedra vos originem reddite, qui vobis vultis sanctam Ecclesiam vindicare. Optatus l. 2. Sed suspicor hæc verba (unde Cephas appellatus est) esse ineptæ alicujus glossæ ad marginem temerè ascriptæ, & deinde abs librariis contextui insertæ. Balduin. in Optat. l. 2.

Apostles should set up others against it; so that he must be a *Schismatick* and offender, who should place another chair against that. Therefore in this one chair *S. Peter* sate first, to whom succeeded *Linus*, to him *Clemens* and so on to *Syricius* who joyns with us, with whom the whole world communicates by the intercourse of formed letters. Do you now give an account of your chair, who challenge to your selves the name of the *Holy Church*. To pass by that ridiculous account of the name *Cephas*, which *Baldwin* supposes to be inserted into the text from some ignorant gloss made in the margin, the main thing to be considered, is the scope and design of these words; in which he doth two things, 1. He shews the evident succession of the *Catholick Bishops* from *S. Peter* in the *Church* of *Rome*, which he doth by a distinct and particular enumeration of them. 2. From

thence shews the unlawfulness of setting up another chair in opposition to that, i. e. pretending to another right of *Government* than what was conveyed

veyed down from the *Apostles*; or setting up another *Chair* in opposition to that of *St. Peter* at *Rome*, i. e. that succession of *Bishops* which was derived from him. Now, saith he, God providing for the *Unity* of the *Church*, intended there should be but one *Chair* in a place, i. e. that the several *Apostles* should not in the same place set up a distinct *Cathedra* or succession of *Church-Governours*; and therefore though *St. Paul* as well as *St. Peter* were instrumental in the settling the *Church of Rome*, yet, that the *Churches Unity* might be preserved, there were not two distinct series of *Bishops*, the one deriving from *St. Peter*, and the other from *St. Paul*. So that *Optatus* his saying is much of the same nature with that of *Cyprian* in the case of the Schism about *Cornelius* and *Novatianus*, who urgeth that most, That there ought to be but one *Bishop* in one *Church*, now the *Bishop* and his *Cathedra* are correlates to each other. *Optatus* therefore saying that there was but one *Cathedra* at *Rome*, puts the *Donatists* upon this issue, that if they could not deduce their succession from *St. Peter* at *Rome*, they could have no pretence to the *Cathedra* there. And therefore challengeth them to deduce the Succession of their *Bishops* there, as at large appears in his following discourse. Which could be no higher than of *Macrobius* from *Encolpius*, *Encolpius* from *Bonifacius Ballitanus*, as he from *Victor Garbiensis*, who was sent over on purpose from the *Donatists* in *Africk* to make a faction and a party at *Rome*, among the *African Inhabitants* there. Now this being the utmost succession

Ubi sedit victor Garbiensis, à vestris jam dudum de Africâ ad paucos erraticos missus, &c. Optatus ibid.

they could pretend to, and that being in opposition to that succession which was derived from *St. Peter*, nothing could be more plain than that at *Rome* (about which the Contest was) the *Cathedra* could not belong to the *Donatists* but their *Adversaries*; and therefore that being by *Parmenianus* acknowledged one of the *Dowries* of the *Catholick Church*, the title of that could not belong to the *Donatists* but their opposers. This therefore doth not at all concern *Rome* being causally the *Catholick Church*, but is only produced as a particular *Church* for a known instance whereby to decide this particular Controversie of succession. For otherwise the Argument would have held as well for any other *Apostolical Church* where the Succession was clear:

And therefore afterwards he makes the *Communion with the seven Churches* as plain an argument of communion with the *Catholick*, as he doth here of the *Church of Rome*.

Extra septem Ecclesias quicquid foris est, alienum est. Id. ib.

You may therefore every jot as well make the *seven Churches of Asia*, to be causally the *Catholick Church*, as the *Church of Rome*. And to the same purpose he instanceth in the *Corinthian*, *Thessalonian*, *Galatian Churches*, as he doth in that of *Rome*, or the *seven Churches*. We see then, *Optatus* his design was to shew that their *Church* from which the *Donatists* separated, was the true *Catholick Church*, which he proves

Tibi unitas displicet; hoc si crimen putas, argue nos Theſſalonicenſibus, Corinthiis, Galatis, septem Ecclesiis quæ sunt in Asia, communicasse. Ibid.

from their *Communion* with all the *Apostolical Churches*, which had a clear and distinct succession from the *Apostles* their planters. And because of the *Vicinity* and *Fame* of *Rome*, and the easier knowing the succession there, he instanceth in that in the first place, and then proceeds to the rest of them. But withal, to shew the *Unity* of all these *Apostolical Churches*, when he had mentioned *Siricius* as the present *Bishop* of *Rome*, he adds, That all the world agreed with him in the intercourse of the formed Letters; not thereby intimating any supremacy of that *Church* above others, but to shew that that succession he instanceth in at *Rome*, was of the *Catholick Church*, because the whole *Christian World*, did agree in *Communion* with him that was the *Bishop* there. And when he

Percurre Ecclesias Apostolicas apud quas ipsa nunc Cathedra Apostolorum suis locis praesidentur. Tertul. praescript. ad haeret. cap. 36.
Euseb. hist. Eccles. l. 7. c. 32.

he speaks of one Chair, it is plain, he means it of the particular Church of Rome, because every Apostolical Church had an Apostolical Chair belonging to it. So Tertullian expressly, *That in all the Apostolical Churches there were their Chairs still remaining.* And Eusebius

particularly mentions the Apostolical Throne or Chair at Hierusalem, as others do that of Mark at Alexandria, and of the rest elsewhere. Nothing then can possibly be inferred from these words of Optatus concerning the Church of Rome, but what would equally hold for any other Apostolical Church, and how much that is, let the Reader judge: And how much soever it be, it will be very little for your advantage, who pretend to something peculiar to the Church of Rome above all other Churches.

§. 15.
 Ibid.

From Optatus you proceed, or rather return to St. Hierom, who, (say you) professes the Church is built upon St. Peter's See, and that whoever eats the

Ego nullum primum (primum fortasse rectius) nisi Christum sequens, beatitudini tuae, id est Cathedrae Petri communionem confocior. Super illam Petram edificatam Ecclesiam scio. Quicumque extra hanc domum Agnum comederit, profanus est. Quicumque tecum non colligit, spargit, hoc est, qui Christi non est, Antichristi est. Hieron. ep. 57. ad Damas.

Lamb, that is, pretends to believe in Christ, and partakes of the Sacraments out of that house, that is, out of the Communion of that Church, is prophane, and an Alien; yea, that he belongs to Antichrist, and not to Christ, whoever consents not with the successor of St. Peter. This Testimony sounds big and high at first, and I shall not impute these expressions either to St. Hierom's heat, or his flattery, although it looks the more suspicious, be-

cause at that time he had so great a Pique against the Eastern Bishops, and that these words are contained in a complemental Address to Damasus. But, setting aside what advantages might be gained on that account, to weaken the force of this Testimony, if we consider the occasion or nature of these expressions, we shall find that they reach not the purpose you design them for. We must therefore consider, that at the time of the writing this Epistle, St. Hierom seems to be in a great perplexity what to do in that division which was then in the Church of Antioch, concerning Paulinus, Vitalis, and Miletus; but besides this Schism, it seems St. Hierom suspected some remainders of Arrianism to be still among them; from their demanding of him, Whether he acknowledged three distinct Hypostases in the Trinity.

Theodoret.
 l. 2. c. 8.

Now St. Hierom by hypostasis understands the essence, as many of the Greek Fathers did; and thence the Sardican Council defined, *That there was but one hypostasis of the Father, Son, and Spirit*; and therefore he suspects, that when they require of him the acknowledgment of three hypostases, they might design to entrap him, and unawares betray him into Arrianism. And

Tota secularium literarum Schola nihil aliud hypostasim nisi uiciorum novit. Id. ib.

therefore argues stiffly in the remainder of that Epistle, that hypostasis properly signifies essence, and nothing else; (and from thence urgeth the inconveni-

ence of admitting the terms of three hypostases. Now St. Hierom being thus set upon by these Eastern Bishops, he keeps off from Communion with them, and adviseth with the Egyptian Confessors, and follows them at present; but having received his Baptism in the Church of Rome, and being looked

Inde nunc mea anima postulans cibum, unde olim Christi vestimenta suscepi. Ib.
Ab Arrianorum praesule & Campensibus, novellum à me homine Romano nomen exigitur. Ib.

on as a Roman where he was, he thought it necessary to address himself to Pope Damasus, to know what he should do in this case. And the rather, because if St. Hierom had consented with them, they would have looked on it as an evidence of the agreement of

the Roman Church with them. Therefore he so earnestly and importunately writes to Damasus concerning it, as being originally part of his charge, having been Baptized in that Church.

But (say you) whatever the occasion of the words were, Is it not plain, that he makes the Church to be built on St. Peter's See, and that whosoever is out of the Communion of that Church, is an Alien, and belongs to Antichrist? To that therefore I answer, 1. That he doth not say, that the Catholick Church is built on the particular Church of Rome: For it is not, *super hanc Petram*, as referring to the *Cathedra* immediately preceding; but, *super illam*, and therefore it is not improbably supposed by some, that the *Rock* here refers to *Christ*. And, although *Erasmus* doth imagine, that some particular privilege and dignity did belong to *Rome* above other Churches from this place, (which is not the thing we contend about) yet withal he says, that by the *Rock* we must not understand *Rome*; for that may degenerate: But we must understand that Faith which Peter professed. And it is a much easier matter for *Marianus Victorius*, to tell him, he lyes, as he doth here in plain terms, than to be able to confute what he saith. And that the rather, because he begins his Discourse in that manner, *Ego nullum primum nisi Christum sequens*, whereby he attributes the supreme Power, and infallible judgment in the Church only to *Christ*. For, as for your learned correction of *primum* for *primum*, though you follow Cardinal Perron in it, yet it is without any probability at all, it being contrary to all the MSS. used by *Erasmus*, *Victorius*, *Gravins*, *Possevin*, and others; and hath no authority to vouch it, but only *Gratian*, who is condemned by your own Writers, for a falsifier and corrupter of Authors.

Non super Romam arbitror, nam fieri potest ut Roma degeneret, sed super illam fidem quam Petrus professus est. Erasmus in Schol. Et si non minus alius eam laborasse, Erasmus hic mensiatur. Mar. Victor. Schol. in ep. 57.

2. I answer, when St. Hierom pronounces those Aliens and Prophane, who are out of the Communion of the Church; either it belongs not to the particular Church of Rome, or, if it doth, it makes not much for your purpose, 1. There is no certainty that he there speaks of the particular Church of Rome, but that he rather speaks of the true Universal Church; for it is plain, he speaks of that Church which is built upon the Rock: Now by your own confession, that cannot be the Church of Rome, for that you suppose to be the Rock it self, viz. the See of Peter, and therefore the Church built upon it, must be the Universal Church. And that this must be his meaning, appears from his plain words, for he saith, Upon that Rock the Church is built, and whosoever eats the Lamb without this house, is prophane; — he cannot certainly mean, Whosoever eats without the Rock, but without the House built upon it; so that the house in the latter clause must needs be the same with that which was built on the Rock in the former. Either therefore you must deny the See of Peter to be the Rock, or you must of necessity assert the house built upon it to be the Universal Church, and not the particular one of Rome; and consequently the danger lies not upon Mens not being in Communion with the Roman, but with the truly Catholick Church. And how from hence you will infer, That they are prophane who are out of the Roman Church; it would be worth our while to understand. 2. Suppose I should grant, that St. Hierom did mean the particular Church of Rome, yet I am not satisfied, that this comes home to your purpose, unless you could prove, that St. Hierom spake of what was necessarily and unalterably to be in the Church of Rome, and not meerly of what was in that time, when he spake these words. But that is your perpetual Paralogism in the citations of the Fathers, in praise of the Church of Rome, what they spake, and it may be deservedly of the Church of their own time (although sometimes their Rhetorick swell'd too high in their Encomiasticks) that you will needs have to be understood of the same Church at all times, and in our present Age. As though it were not possible for a Church to be eminent for purity of Doctrine

Vid. Fortunat. & Accacium.

Trine in one Age, and to decline as much from it in another. But I need give no other instance in this case, than St. Hierom himself, for if we believe St. Hierom in his Catalogue, the two immediate predecessors of Damasus, in the See of Rome, Liberius, and Felix were tainted with Heresie; and that very Heresie, viz. Arrianism, which St. Hierom writes to Damasus about now. I pray, tell us then, Whether if St. Hierom had lived in Liberius his time, would he have writ to him after the same rate he now writes to Damasus; if he had been of the same mind then, he would have been so far from scrupling the three hypostases, that he must have subscribed the Arrian confession, as St. Hierom tells us, Liberius did, through the instigation of Fortunatianus. And therefore to let us see, on what account he was now so liberal in his commendations of the Church of Rome, he begins this Epistle with the praise

Profligato à sobole mala patrimonio, apud vos solus incorrupta Patrum servatur hereditas. — Nunc in Occidente Sol Justitia oritur, in Oriente autem Lucifer ille, qui reciderat, super sidera posuit thronum suum, &c. Ibid.

of her present Orthodoxnes in the Catholick Faith, And that amongst all the divisions and breaches of the Eastern Churches, they preserved the Faith of their Fore-fathers entire. That now the Sun of Righteousness arises in the West; but that Lucifer, who fell, now reigns in the East; with many expressions to the same purpose. Which suppo-

sition being granted true at that time, that which follows infers very little to your purpose, unless you can prove, that what was so then, must necessarily continue so in all ages. If the East was then corrupted, and the West only sound, what praises belonged to the Catholick Church in general, did of right devolve to that part which remained sound in the opinion of those persons who judged so. You would needs therefore from hence have your Church accounted Catholick now, by the same argument that Tully said (of the Roman Lady, who still affirmed, she was but thirty years of age) that he believed it, for he had heard her say so twenty Years before; so must we believe your Church sound and Catholick, because it was said so of her so many hundred years since; as though no Infirmities or Wrinkles could have come upon her ever since. Prove your Church to be as sound and orthodox, as pure and holy now, as she was in the primitive Fathers time, and we will not grudge her the highest of those commendations which were given her by them. But, without doing this, your Testimonies come to nothing. The same Answer will serve the remaining Testimonies of Eulalius, and the Emperor Gratian, who only spake of the Communion of the Church of Rome, as it was then: That of Fulgentius styling the Roman Church, The top of the World, only imports the eminency of it, in regard of the power of that City it was in, and so is wide enough from your purpose. Thus we have considered all that you have produced out of Antiquity, to prove that the Church is called Catholick, with a particular relation to, and dependence on the Church of Rome, and can find nothing at all belonging to her, as the center of Catholicism, but that those things which are said of her, and Communion with her, in relation to being called Catholick, might as well have agreed with any other Apostolical Church remaining sound in the Catholick Faith.

P. 132. n. 6.

Hence it appears, that what his Lordship is pleased to term, a perfect Jesuitism, viz. the measuring the Catholick Church, by that of Rome, is really nothing else, and that the perfect mistake belongs to you, who assert, that it was a received and known Truth in the ancient Church. Your vindication of the propriety of your Churches being called the Roman Catholick Church, from the Roman Empire, and the Jewish Church, would then signifie something, when you have proved that the Pope hath as much the Government of the Church, as the Roman Emperour had of all the Provinces within the confines

confines of the *Empire*, or that we are all bound as much to resort to *Rome*, as the *Jews* were to *Jerusalem* for the solemn worship of God. In the mean time the absurdity is never the less for being vulgar, in calling yours, The *Roman Catholick Church*. And yet, as tho' you had been only demonstrating these things, you tell us very magisterially, *The truth is, in all doubts concerning matter of Doctrine, recourse is to be had to S. Peter's successor, who (at least with a General Council) can infallibly resolve all difficulties.* An excellent way of proving, to say, *The truth is*, Might not I as well say, *The truth is*, the Pope neither in Council, nor out of it hath any Infallibility at all? And would not this be full as good an Answer as yours is an Argument? But the very truth is, you had rather have these things believed, than go about to prove them; lest the weakness of the arguments should lay too much open your fond pretence of *Infallibility*. Before you prove, *That the Pope can carry his Infallibility out of Rome with him*, shew us that he hath it there. I grant S. Peter had been infallible, tho' he had never been at Rome; and it is far from being clear, that the Pope is at all the more infallible for his being there. How far you have been from proving, *That the Faith of every particular Church is to be examined and proved to be Catholick by its conformity to the Faith of the Roman Church*, may abundantly appear from the preceding discourse. Those Questions, which you say, make nothing to your purpose concerning the Popes transferring his chair at Rome, and the Roman Clergies deserting him and the true Faith: I shall so far believe you in, as to ease my self of the trouble of considering them any further than hath been done already in the very entrance into this Conference.

And here, you tell us, *You now come to perform your Promise, viz. to examine more fully his Lordships pretended solutions (as you call them) of Bellarmine's authorities in behalf of the Infallibility of the Church of Rome.* But for all your boasting at first, what great things you would do, you seem a little fearful of engaging too far, and therefore are resolved only to maintain them in general, as they make for the *Infallible Authority* of the Church, or of the Pope defining Articles of Faith in a General Council. But, as far as you dare go, I shall attend your motions, and doubt not to make it evident, that none of these authorities have any reference to that sense, which you only offer to maintain them in, and that though they had, yet no such thing as *Infallibility* can be proved out of them.

The first authority is out of S. Cyprian's Letter to Cornelius Bishop of Rome, whose words I am contented should be recited as fully as may be; In which he chargeth *Felicissimus* and *Fortunatus* with their Complices, that having set up a Bishop against him at Carthage, they sail to the chair of Peter, and the principal Church from whence the sacerdotal Unity had its rise, and carry Letters from prophane and Schismatical persons, not considering that the Romans (whose Faith was committed by the Apostle) were such to whom perfidiousness could not have access. Now the meaning of this place you would have to be this, and no other, viz. that the See of S. Peter, which is the principal of all Churches, was so infallibly directed by the Holy Ghost, that no error in Faith could have access to it, or be admitted by it, if not as a particular Church, yet at least as the head of the Universal Church of Christ, and as the Fountain of Priestly Unity; which S. Cyprian here expressly affirms that Church and See to be. Thus you sum up at last, as the most which can be made of this Testimony; and which is indeed far more in all particulars than it can amount to, which will appear by particular examinations of what you return in

R r

answer

S. 16.

P. 133.

Post ista adhuc insuper pseudoepiscopo sibi ab hæreticis constituto, navigare audent ad Petri Cathedram, atq; ad Ecclesiam Principalem; unde unitas sacerdotalis exorta est, à Schismaticis & prophanis literas ferre, nec cogitare eos esse Romanos (quorum fides Apostolo predicante laudata est) ad quos perfidia habere non possit accessum. Cyprian. ep. 55. ad Cornel. n. 16.

P. 134.

Trine in one Age, and to decline as much from it in another. But I need give no other instance in this case, than St. Hierom himself, for if we believe St. Hierom in his Catalogue, the two immediate predecessors of Damasus, in the See of Rome, Liberius, and Felix were tainted with Hereſie; and that very Hereſie, viz. Arrianism, which St. Hierom writes to Damasus about now. I pray, tell us then, Whether if St. Hierom had lived in Liberius his time, would he have writ to him after the same rate he now writes to Damasus; if he had been of the same mind then, he would have been so far from scrupling the three hypostases, that he must have subscribed the Arrian confession, as St. Hierom tells us, Liberius did, through the instigation of Fortunatianus. And therefore to let us see, on what account he was now so liberal in his commendations of the Church of Rome, he begins this Epistle with the praise

Profligato à sobole mala patrimonio, apud vos solus incorrupta Patrum servatur hereditas. — Nunc in Occidente Sol Justitiæ oritur, in Oriente autem Lucifer ille, qui ceciderat, super sidera posuit thronum suum, &c. Ibid.

of her present Orthodoxy in the Catholick Faith, And that amongst all the divisions and breaches of the Eastern Churches, they preserved the Faith of their Fore-fathers entire. That now the Sun of Righteousness arises in the West; but that Lucifer, who fell, now reigns in the East; with many expressions to the same purpose. Which suppo-

sition being granted true at that time, that which follows infers very little to your purpose, unless you can prove, that what was so then, must necessarily continue so in all ages. If the East was then corrupted, and the West only sound, what praises belonged to the Catholick Church in general, did of right devolve to that part which remained sound in the opinion of those persons who judged so. You would needs therefore from hence have your Church accounted Catholick now, by the same argument that Tully said (of the Roman Lady, who still affirmed, she was but thirty years of age) that he believed it, for he had heard her say so twenty Years before; so must we believe your Church sound and Catholick, because it was said so of her so many hundred years since; as though no Infirmities or Wrinkles could have come upon her ever since. Prove your Church to be as sound and orthodox, as pure and holy now, as she was in the primitive Fathers time, and we will not grudge her the highest of those commendations which were given her by them. But, without doing this, your Testimonies come to nothing. The same Answer will serve the remaining Testimonies of Eulalius, and the Emperor Gratian, who only spake of the Communion of the Church of Rome, as it was then: That of Fulgentius styling the Roman Church, The top of the World, only imports the eminency of it, in regard of the power of that City it was in, and so is wide enough from your purpose. Thus we have considered all that you have produced out of Antiquity, to prove that the Church is called Catholick, with a particular relation to, and dependence on the Church of Rome, and can find nothing at all belonging to her, as the center of Catholicism, but that those things which are said of her, and Communion with her, in relation to being called Catholick, might as well have agreed with any other Apostolical Church remaining found in the Catholick Faith.

P. 132. n. 6. Hence it appears, that what his Lordship is pleased to term, a perfect Jesuitism, viz. the measuring the Catholick Church, by that of Rome, is really nothing else, and that the perfect mistake belongs to you, who assert, that it was a received and known Truth in the ancient Church. Your vindication of the propriety of your Churches being called the Roman Catholick Church, from the Roman Empire, and the Jewish Church, would then signifie something, when you have proved that the Pope hath as much the Government of the Church, as the Roman Emperour had of all the Provinces within the confines

confines of the *Empire*, or that we are all bound as much to resort to *Rome*, as the *Jews* were to *Jerusalem* for the solemn worship of God. In the mean time the absurdity is never the less for being vulgar, in calling yours, *The Roman Catholick Church*. And yet, as tho' you had been only demonstrating these things, you tell us very magisterially, *The truth is, in all doubts concerning matter of Doctrine, recourse is to be had to S. Peter's successor, who (at least with a General Council) can infallibly resolve all difficulties.* An excellent way of proving, to say, *The truth is*, Might not I as well say, *The truth is*, the Pope neither in Council, nor out of it hath any Infallibility at all? And would not this be full as good an Answer as yours is an Argument? But the very truth is, you had rather have these things believed, than go about to prove them; lest the weakness of the arguments should lay too much open your fond pretence of *Infallibility*. Before you prove, *That the Pope can carry his Infallibility out of Rome with him*, shew us that he hath it there. I grant S. Peter had been infallible, tho' he had never been at Rome; and it is far from being clear, that the Pope is at all the more infallible for his being there. How far you have been from proving, *That the Faith of every particular Church is to be examined and proved to be Catholick by its conformity to the Faith of the Roman Church*, may abundantly appear from the preceding discourse. Those Questions, which you say, make nothing to your purpose concerning the Popes transferring his chair at Rome, and the Roman Clergies deserting him and the true Faith: I shall so far believe you in, as to ease my self of the trouble of considering them any further than hath been done already in the very entrance into this Conference.

And here, you tell us, *You now come to perform your Promise, viz. to examine more fully his Lordships pretended solutions (as you call them) of Bellarmine's authorities in behalf of the Infallibility of the Church of Rome.* But for all your boasting at first, what great things you would do, you seem a little fearful of engaging too far, and therefore are resolved only to maintain them in general, as they make for the *Infallible Authority* of the Church, or of the Pope defining Articles of Faith in a General Council. But, as far as you dare go, I shall attend your motions, and doubt not to make it evident, that none of these authorities have any reference to that sense, which you only offer to maintain them in, and that though they had, yet no such thing as *Infallibility* can be proved out of them.

§. 16.

The first authority is out of S. Cyprian's Letter to Cornelius Bishop of Rome, whose words I am contented should be recited as fully as may be; In which he chargeth *Felissimus* and *Fortunatus* with their Complices, that having set up a Bishop against him at Carthage, they sail to the chair of Peter, and the principal Church from whence the sacerdotal Unity had its rise, and carry Letters from prophane and Schismatical persons, not considering that the Romans (whose Faith was committed by the Apostle) were such to whom perfidiousness could not have access. Now the meaning of this place you would have to be this,

P. 133.

and no other, viz. that the See of S. Peter, which is the principal of all Churches, was so infallibly directed by the Holy Ghost, that no error in Faith could have access to it, or be admitted by it, if not as a particular Church, yet at least as the head of the Universal Church of Christ, and as the Fountain of Priestly Unity; which S. Cyprian here expressly affirms that Church and See to be. Thus you sum up at last, as the most which can be made of this Testimony; and which is indeed far more in all particulars than it can amount to, which will appear by particular examinations of what you return in

P. 134.

Post ista adhuc insuper pseudoepiscopo sibi ab hæreticis constituto, navigare audent ad Petri Cathedram, atq; ad Ecclesiam Principalem; unde unitas sacerdotalis exorta est, à Schismaticis & prophanis literas ferre, nec cogitare eos esse Romanos (quorum fides Apostolo predicante laudata est) ad quos perfidia habere non possit accessum. Cyprian. ep. 55. ad Cornel. n. 16.

R r

answer

Sect. 3. n.
3, &c.

answer to his Lordship. Three thinks his Lordship answers to this place.

1. *That perfidia can hardly stand here for error in Faith*; and if so, then this can make nothing for *Infallibility*. 2. *That supposing it granted to signifie error in Faith and Doctrine, yet it belongs not to the Romans absolutely, but with a respect to those first Romans whose Faith was commended by the Apostle.* 3. *That it seems to be rather a Rhetorical insinuation, than a dogmatical assertion.* And that S. Cyprian could not be supposed to assert herein the Popes *Infallibility*, appears by the *contracts* between him and the Bishops of Rome. This is the short of his Lordships answer to this place, to which we must consider what you reply. 1. His Lordship says, *That perfidia can hardly stand for error in Faith or misbelief, but it properly signifies malicious falsehood in matter of trust and action, not error in Faith, but in fact against the discipline and Government of the Church.* And to make this interpretation appear the more probable, his Lordship gives an account of the story which was the occasion of writing that *Epistle*, which is this, as his Lordship reports it from *Binius* and *Baronius*; *In the year 255. there was a Council in Carthage in the cause of two Schismatics, Felicissimus and Novatian, about restoring of them to the communion of the Church, which had lapsed in time of danger from Christianity to Idolatry. Felicissimus would admit all even without penance, and Novatian would admit none, no not after penance. The Fathers 42 in number went, as Truth led them, between both extrems. To this Council came Privatus a known Heretick, but was not admitted because he was formerly excommunicated, and often condemned. Hereupon he gathers his Complices together, and chooses one Fortunatus (who was formerly condemned as well as himself) Bishop of Carthage, and set him up against S. Cyprian. This done Felicissimus and his Fellows haste to Rome with letters testimonial from their own party, and pretend that 25 Bishops concurred with them: and their desire was to be received into the communion of the Roman Church, and to have their new Bishop acknowledged. Cornelius then Pope, though their haste had now prevented S. Cyprian's letters, having formerly heard from him, both of them, and their Schism in Affrick, would neither hear them, nor receive their letters. They grew insolent and furious (the ordinary way that Schismatics take.) Upon this Cornelius writes to S. Cyprian, and S. Cyprian in this Epistle gives Cornelius thanks for refusing these African fugitives, declares their Schism and wickedness at large, and encourages him and all Bishops to maintain the Ecclesiastical Discipline and censures against any the boldest threatnings of wicked Schismatics. This being the story, his Lordship says, He would fain know why perfidia (all circumstances considered) may not stand here in its proper sense for cunning and perfidious dealing, which these Men having practised at Carthage, thought now to obtrude upon the Bishop of Rome also, but that he was wary enough not to be over-reached by busie Schismatics?* This demand of his Lordship seeming very just and reasonable we are bound to consider what reasons you give, why perfidia must be understood for error in Faith and not in the sense here mentioned. Why calls he (say you) S. Peter's chair, *Ecclesiam principalem* (the chief Church) but because it is the head to which all other Churches must be subordinate in matter of doctrine? the words following signifie as much, *Unde unitas sacerdotalis exorta est, from which chair of S. Peter as it were from its fountain, unity in Priesthood and consequently unity in Faith derived.* Why brings he the Apostle as Panegyrist of the Roman Faith? Is it forsooth, because no malicious falsehood in matter of trust or error in fact against the Discipline and Government of the Church can have access unto them, as the Bishop will needs misinterpret the place? or rather because no error in Faith can approach the See Apostolick? Certain it is, perfidia in this sense, is diametrically

P. 113.

cally opposed to the Faith of the Romans immediately before commended by the Apostie (which was true Christian Faith) and consequently it must of necessity be taken for the quite contrary, viz. misbelief or error in Faith. Three Arguments in these words you produce, why *perfidia* must be understood of error in Faith. 1. Because the Church of Rome is called the chief Church; but is it not possible it should be called so in any other sense, but as the head of all other Churches in matter of doctrine? Is it not sufficiently clear from Antiquity, that there were other accounts of calling the Church of Rome the chief or principal Church, as the eminency of it joyned with the power of the City (the *potentior principalitas* in *Irenæus*) which advanced its reputation to the height it was then at? What matters of doctrine do you find brought to the Church of Rome to be Infallibly decided there in S. Cyprian's time? how little did S. Cyprian believe this, when he so vehemently opposed the judgment of Stephen Bishop of Rome in the case of rebaptization? Doth he write, speak, or carry himself in that Controversie like one that owned the Church of Rome to be head of all other Churches, to which they must be subordinate in matter of doctrine? Nay in the very next words S. Cyprian argues against appeals to Rome, and is it possible then to think, that in these words he should give such an absolute power and authority to it? And therefore any one who would reconcile S. Cyprian to himself must by those words of *Ecclesia principalis* only understand the dignity and eminency, and not the power, much less the Infallibility of the Church of Rome. And no more is implied in the Second, That it is said to be the fountain of Sacerdotal Unity, which some think may probably refer to the Priesthood of the Church of Africk, which had its rise from the Church of Rome, as appears by Tertullian and others, in which sense he might very well say, that the Unity of the Priesthood did spring from thence; or if it be taken in a more large and comprehensive sense, it can import no more than that the Church of Rome was owned as the *Principium Unitatis*, which certainly is a very different thing from an infallible judgment in matters of Faith. For what connexion is there between Unity in Government, and Infallibility in Faith? Suppose the Church of Rome should be owned as the principal Member of the Catholick Church, and therefore that the Unity of the Church should begin there in regard of the dignity of it, doth it thence follow that there must be an absolute subordination of all other Churches to it? Nothing then can be infer'd from either of those particulars, that by *perfidia*, error in Faith must be understood, taking those two expressions in the most favourable sense that can be put upon them. But considering the present state of the Church of Rome at the time when *Felicissimus* and *Fortunatus* came thither, I am apt to think another interpretation more probable than either of the foregoing. For which we must remember that there was a Schism at Rome between *Novatianus* and *Cornelius*, the former challenging to be Bishop there, as well as the latter, upon which a great breach was made among them. Now these persons going out of Africa to Rome, that they might manage their business with the more advantage, address themselves to *Cornelius* and his party; upon which S. Cyprian saith, *Navigare audent ad Petri Cathedram atque ad Ecclesiam principalem, unde Unitas sacerdotalis exorta est*, thereby expressing their confidence that they not only went to Rome, but when they were there, they did not presently side with the Schismatical party of the Novatians there, but as tho' they had been true Catholics, they go to *Cornelius*, who being the legal successor of S. Peter in opposition to *Novatianus*, calls his See the chair of S. Peter, and the principal Church, and the spring of the Unity of the Priesthood; because the contra-

Tertul. de
prescript. c.
36. Greg. l.
7. Ind. 1.
ep. 32.

Sect. 3. n.
3, &c.

answer to his Lordship. Three thinks his Lordship answers to this place. 1. That perfidia can hardly stand here for error in Faith; and if so, then this can make nothing for Infallibility. 2. That supposing it granted to signifie error in Faith and Doctrine, yet it belongs not to the Romans absolutely, but with a respect to those first Romans whose Faith was commended by the Apostle. 3. That it seems to be rather a Rhetorical insinuation, than a dogmatical assertion. And that S. Cyprian could not be supposed to assert herein the Popes Infallibility, appears by the contracts between him and the Bishops of Rome. This is the short of his Lordships answer to this place, to which we must consider what you reply. 1. His Lordship says, That perfidia can hardly stand for error in Faith or misbelief, but it properly signifies malicious falsehood in matter of trust and action, not error in Faith, but in fact against the discipline and Government of the Church. And to make this interpretation appear the more probable, his Lordship gives an account of the story which was the occasion of writing that Epistle, which is this, as his Lordship reports it from Binus and Baronius; In the year 255. there was a Council in Carthage in the cause of two Schismatics, Felicissimus and Novatian, about restoring of them to the communion of the Church, which had lapsed in time of danger from Christianity to Idolatry. Felicissimus would admit all even without penance, and Novatian would admit none, no not after penance. The Fathers 42 in number went, as Truth led them, between both extremes. To this Council came Privatus a known Heretick, but was not admitted because he was formerly excommunicated, and often condemned. Hereupon he gathers his Complices together, and chooses one Fortunatus (who was formerly condemned as well as himself) Bishop of Carthage, and set him up against S. Cyprian. This done Felicissimus and his Fellows haste to Rome with letters testimonial from their own party, and pretend that 25 Bishops concurred with them: and their desire was to be received into the communion of the Roman Church, and to have their new Bishop acknowledged. Cornelius then Pope, though their haste had now prevented S. Cyprian's letters, having formerly heard from him, both of them, and their Schism in Affrick, would neither hear them, nor receive their letters. They grew insolent and furious (the ordinary way that Schismatics take.) Upon this Cornelius writes to S. Cyprian, and S. Cyprian in this Epistle gives Cornelius thanks for refusing these African fugitives, declares their Schism and wickedness at large, and encourages him and all Bishops to maintain the Ecclesiastical Discipline and censures against any the boldest threatnings of wicked Schismatics. This being the story, his Lordship says, He would fain know why perfidia (all circumstances considered) may not stand here in its proper sense for cunning and perfidious dealing, which these Men having practised at Carthage, thought now to obtrude upon the Bishop of Rome also, but that he was wary enough not to be over-reached by busie Schismatics? This demand of his Lordship seeming very just and reasonable we are bound to consider what reasons you give, why perfidia must be understood for error in Faith and not in the sense here mentioned. Why calls he (say you) S. Peter's chair, Ecclesiam principalem (the chief Church) but because it is the head to which all other Churches must be subordinate in matter of doctrine? the words following signifie as much, Unde unitas sacerdotalis exorta est, from which chair of S. Peter as it were from its fountain, unity in Priesthood and consequently unity in Faith derived. Why brings he the Apostle as Panegyrist of the Roman Faith? Is it forsooth, because no malicious falsehood in matter of trust or error in fact against the Discipline and Government of the Church can have access unto them, as the Bishop will needs misinterpret the place? or rather because no error in Faith can approach the See Apostolick? Certain it is, perfidia in this sense, is diametrically

P. 113.

cally opposed to the Faith of the Romans immediately before commended by the Apostle (which was true Christian Faith) and consequently it must of necessity be taken for the quite contrary, viz. *misbelief or error in Faith*. Three Arguments in these words you produce, why *perfidia* must be understood of *error in Faith*. 1. *Because the Church of Rome is called the chief Church*; but is it not possible it should be called so in any other sense, but as the head of all other Churches in matter of doctrine? Is it not sufficiently clear from Antiquity, that there were other accounts of calling the Church of Rome the chief or principal Church, as the eminency of it joynd with the power of the City (the *potentior principalitas* in Irenæus) which advanced its reputation to the height it was then at? What matters of doctrine do you find brought to the Church of Rome to be *Infallibly* decided there in S. Cyprian's time? how little did S. Cyprian believe this, when he so vehemently opposed the judgment of Stephen Bishop of Rome in the case of rebaptization? Doth he write, speak, or carry himself in that Controversie like one that owned the Church of Rome to be head of all other Churches, to which they must be subordinate in matter of doctrine? Nay in the very next words S. Cyprian argues against appeals to Rome; and is it possible then to think, that in these words he should give such an *absolute power and authority* to it? And therefore any one who would reconcile S. Cyprian to himself must by those words of *Ecclesia principalis* only understand the *dignity and eminency*, and not the *power*, much less the *Infallibility* of the Church of Rome. And no more is implied in the Second, *That it is said to be the fountain of Sacerdotal Unity*, which some think may probably refer to the Priesthood of the Church of Africk, which had its rise from the Church of Rome, as appears by Tertullian and others, in which sense he might very well say, that the *Unity of the Priesthood did spring from thence*; or if it be taken in a more large and comprehensive sense, it can import no more than that the Church of Rome was owned as the *Principium Unitatis*, which certainly is a very different thing from an *infallible judgment* in matters of Faith. For what connexion is there between *Unity in Government*, and *Infalibility in Faith*? Suppose the Church of Rome should be owned as the *principal Member* of the Catholick Church, and therefore that the *Unity of the Church* should begin there in regard of the *dignity* of it, doth it thence follow that there must be an *absolute subordination* of all other Churches to it? Nothing then can be inferr'd from either of those particulars, that by *perfidia*, error in Faith must be understood, taking those two expressions in the most favourable sense that can be put upon them. But considering the present state of the Church of Rome at the time when *Felicissimus* and *Fortunatus* came thither, I am apt to think another interpretation more probable than either of the foregoing. For which we must remember that there was a *Schism* at Rome between *Novatianus* and *Cornelius*, the former challenging to be Bishop there, as well as the latter, upon which a great breach was made among them. Now these persons going out of Africa to Rome, that they might manage their business with the more advantage, address themselves to *Cornelius* and his party; upon which S. Cyprian saith, *Navigare audent ad Petri Cathedram atque ad Ecclesiam principalem, unde Unitas sacerdotalis exorta est*, thereby expressing their confidence that they not only went to Rome, but when they were there, they did not presently side with the *Schismatical* party of the *Novatians* there, but as tho' they had been *true Catholics*, they go to *Cornelius*, who being the legal successor of S. Peter in opposition to *Novatianus*, calls his See the chair of S. Peter, and the principal Church, and the spring of the *Unity of the Priesthood*; because the contra-

Tertul. de
prescript. c.
36. Greg. l.
7. Ind. 1.
ep. 32.

ry party of *Novatianus* had been the cause of all the *Schism* and *disunion* which had been among them. And in this sense which seems very agreeable to *S. Cyprian's* words and design, we may easily understand what this *perfidia* was, viz. that *falseness* and *perfidious dealing* of these persons, that although they were *Schismaticks* themselves, yet they were so far from seeming so at their coming to *Rome*, that as though they had been very good *Catholicks*, they seek to joyn in communion with *Cornelius* and the *Catholic party* with him. By which we see what little probability there is from those expressions that *perfidia* must be taken, for an *error in Faith*. But, 3. You say, To what purpose else doth he mention *S. Paul's commendation of their Faith*, if this *perfidia* were not immediately opposite to it? But then inform us what part of that *Apostolical Faith* was it, which *Felicissimus* and *Fortunatus* sought to violate at *Rome*? It is apparent their whole design was to be admitted into communion with the Church of *Rome* (which in all probability is that access here spoken of): if therefore this *perfidia* imported some *error in Faith*, it must be some *error* broached by those particular persons as contrary to the old *Roman Faith* which was extoll'd by the *Apostle*. And although these persons might be guilty of *errors*, yet the ground of their going to *Rome*, was not upon any matter of *Doctrine*, whereby they sought to corrupt the Church of *Rome*, but in order to the justifying of their *Schism*, by being admitted into the communion of that Church. Notwithstanding then any thing you have produced to the contrary, there is no necessity of understanding *perfidia*, for an *error in matter of Faith*. And *S. Cyprian's* mentioning the praise given to the *Romans* for their *Faith* by the *Apostle*, was not to shew the opposition between that and the *perfidia* as an *error in Faith*, but that being the greatest *Elogium* of the Church of *Rome* extant in *Scripture*, he thought it now most convenient to use it, the better to engage *Cornelius* to oppose the proceedings of the *Schismaticks* there. Although withal, I suppose, *S. Cyprian* might give him some taste of his old office, of *Rhetorician* in the allusion between *fides* and *perfidia*, without ever intending that *perfidia* should be taken in any other sense than what was proper to the cause in hand.

Ibid.

You having effected so little in the solution of his Lordships first answer, you have little cause to boast in your following words, *That hence his other explication also vanishes into smoke*, viz. when he asserts that *Perfidia* non potest may be taken hyperbolically for non facile potest; because this interpretation suits not with those high *Elogiums* given by *S. Cyprian* to the *Roman Church*, as being the principal Church, the Church whence *Unity of Faith and Discipline* is derived to all other *Christian Churches*. If you indeed may have the liberty to interpret *S. Cyprian's* words as you please, by adding such things to them, of which there is no intimation in what he saith, you may make what you please unsuitable to them. For although he calls it the principal Church, from whence the *Unity of the Priesthood* is sprung; yet what is this to the *Unity of Faith and Discipline* as derived from thence to all other Churches, as you would persuade the unwary reader that these were *S. Cyprian's* words, which are only your groundless interpretation of them. And therefore there is no such improbability in what his Lordship says, *That this may be only a Rhetorical excess of speech*, in which *S. Cyprian* may *laudando præcipere*, by commending them to be such, instruct them that such indeed they ought to be, to whom *perfidiousness* should not get access. And for this he instanceth in such another *Rhetorical expression* of *Symesius* to *Theophilus* of *Alexandria*, wherein he tells him that he ought to esteem what his *Throne* should determine as an *Oracle* or *Divine Law*. And certainly this comes nearer

nearer Infallibility than that of St. Cyprian doth. But what inconveniency there should be, that St. Cyprian by this interpretation should give no more prerogative to the Church of Rome, than to that of Alexandria or Antioch, I cannot easily imagine till you prove some greater Infallibility attributed then to the Church of Rome, than was to other Apostolical Churches: Which as yet we are to seek for.

But at length (you tell us) after much ado he grants perfidia may be taken for error in Faith, or for perfidious Misbelievers and Schismatics, who had betrayed their Faith; but then (say you) he cavils with the word Romanos. This must be limited only to those Christians, who then lived in Rome, to whom quâ tales, as long as they continued such, error in Faith could not have access. What you say, his Lordship doth at length, and after much ado, he did freely and willingly; but that you might have occasion for those words, you altered the course of his answers, and put the second in the last place. But still you have the unhappiness to misunderstand him. For although he grants that perfidia may relate to error in Faith, yet as it is here used, it is not understood of it abstractly but concretely, for perfidious misbelievers, i. e. such perfidious Persons, excommunicated out of other Churches, were not likely to get access at Rome, or to find admittance into their Communion. And in this sense, it is plain that St. Cyprian did not intend by these words, to exempt the Romans from possibility of error, but to brand his Adversaries with a title due to their merit, calling them perfidious, i. e. such as had betrayed or perverted the Faith. When you therefore ask, is not this great praise? I suppose none but your self would make a question of it, viz. that the Church of Rome had then so great purity as not to admit such perfidious Misbelievers into her Communion. And it were well if the present Church of Rome were capable of the same praise. But when you add, It is as if St. Cyprian should say St. Peter's See could not err so long as it continued constant in the Truth; you wilfully misunderstand his Lordship's meaning, who speaks of the Persons and not merely of their errors; but however, is it not a commendation to say that the Church of Rome consisted of such Persons then who adhered to the Apostolical Faith, and therefore error could not have access to them? And I look on it as so great a commendation, that I heartily wish it could be verified of your Church now. Neither is this any such Identical Proposition as that you produce, but only a declaration of their present constancy, and inferring thence, how unlikely it was that errors should be admitted by them. His Lordship to make it plain that St. Cyprian had no meaning to assert the unerring Infallibility of either Pope or Church of Rome, insists on the contest which after happened between St. Cyprian and Pope Stephen; upon which he saith expressly, That Pope Stephen did not only maintain an error but the very cause of Hereticks, and that against Christians and the very Church of God. And after this he chargeth him, with obstinacy and presumption; And I hope this is plain enough (saith his Lordship) to shew that St. Cyprian had no great opinion of the Roman Infallibility. To this you answer, With a famous distinction of the Popes erring as a private Doctor, and as the Universal Pastor, and that St. Cyprian might very well be supposed to think the Pope erred only in the first sense. Not to spend time in risting this distinction of the Popes erring Personally, but not judicially, or as a private Doctor, but not as Universal Pastor, which it were an easie matter to do, by manifesting the incongruity of it, and the absurdities consequent upon it, in case that Doctrine which the Pope errs in, comes

Ibid.

Stephanus frater noster Hæreticorum causam contra Christianos & contra Dei Ecclesiam asserere conatur. Cyp. ad Pompeium per Eras. Basil. p. 327.

P. 134.

comes to be *judicially* decided by him ; It is sufficient for us at present to shew that this distinction cannot relieve you in our present case. For your *Doctors* tell us, the *Pope* then errs *personally* and as a *private Doctor*, when he errs only in his *own judgment* without obliging others to believe, what he judges to be *true* ; but then he errs *judicially* and as *Universal Pastor*, when he declares his judgment so as to oblige others to receive it as *true*. Now can any thing be more evident than that *St. Cyprian* judged *Pope Stephen* to err in this latter, and not in the former sense ? For doth he not absolutely and severely declare himself against *St. Cyprian's Opinion* : Condemning it as an *error* and an *innovation* ? But say you, He did not properly define any *Doctrine* in that *Contestation* ; but said *nihil innovetur nisi quod traditum*. But was not that the question what was *traditum* and what not, for *Cyprian* and his *Party* denied it to be a *Tradition*, which *Stephen* asserted was so ; and doth he not therefore undertake to define something in this cause ? But say you, If this argument hold good against the *Infallibility* of *Popes*, viz. that *St. Cyprian* held *Pope Stephen* erred, therefore the *Pope* may err in matters of *Faith* ; it will be a good consequence also to say, *St. Cyprian* held *Pope Stephen* erred, even whilst he maintained an *universal immemorial Tradition*—therefore the *Pope* may err whilst he follows such a *Tradition*. I answer, 1. Who besides you, would not have seen, that the question was not, Whether the *Pope* was *Infallible* or no, but whether *St. Cyprian* judged him to be *Infallible* or no ? For if it appear that *St. Cyprian* did not judge him *Infallible*, then those former words cannot be interpreted to such a sense as doth imply *Infallibility*. 2. No doubt if the *Pope* may err in other things, he may err when he thinks he follows an *universal immemorial Tradition* ; not that he doth err, when he doth really follow such a one, but he may err in judging that to be an *universal immemorial Tradition* which is not : And this was the case between *St. Cyprian* and *Pope Stephen* ; the *Pope* pretended to follow an *universal Tradition* ; *St. Cyprian* judgeth him to err in it, and that it was not so. And is it not plain still, notwithstanding these frivolous pretences, that *St. Cyprian* had no opinion at all of the *Pope's Infallibility* in any sense ? And therefore out of honour to him, you are bound to interpret his former words to some other sense than that of any *Infallibility* in the Church of *Rome*. Thus all his Lordship's Answers standing good, you have gained no great matter by this first Testimony of *St. Cyprian*.

The second Authority is out of *S. Hierom*, whose words are, *The*

Attamen scito Romanam fidem Apostolicā voce laudatam ejusmodi prestigias non recipere, etiamsi Angelus aliter annunciet, quam semel predicatum est, Pauli auctoritate munitam non posse mutari. Hieron. l. 3. Apol. c. Ruff. cap. 4.

Roman Faith commended by the *Apostle*, admits not such *præstigias*, *deceits* and *delusions* into it, though an *Angel* should Preach it otherwise than it was Preached at first, being armed and fenced by *St. Paul's Authority* it cannot be changed. Here you tell us, You willingly agree with his Lordship that by *Romanam fidem*,

St. Hierom understands the *Catholic Faith* of *Christ*, and so you concur with him against *Bellarmino*, that it cannot be understood of the particular Church of *Rome*. But by the way you charge your Adversaries, with great inconsequence, that in this place they make *Roman* and *Catholic* to be the same, and yet usually condemn you for joyning as *Synonyma's* *Roman* and *Catholic* together. A wonderful want of judgment ! as though the *Roman Faith* might not be the *Catholic Faith* then, and yet the *Catholic Faith* not be the *Roman Faith* now. The former speech only affirms that the Faith at *Rome* was truly *Catholic* ; the latter implies that no Faith can be *Catholic* but what agrees with *Rome* : And think you there is no difference

rence between these two? But you say further, *That this Catholick Faith* P. 135.
must not here be taken abstractly that so it cannot be changed, for Ruffinus was
not ignorant of that, but that it must be understood of the immutable Faith of
the See Apostolick, so highly commended by the Apostle and St. Hierom,
which is founded upon such a rock, that even an Angel himself is not able to
shake it. But St. Hierom speaking this with a reference to that Faith he
 supposeth the Apostle commended in them (although the Apostle doth not
 so much commend the Catholickness or soundness of their Faith as the act of
 believing in them, and therefore whatever is drawn from thence, whether
 by St. Hierom or any else can have no force in it; for if he should infer
 the immutability of the Faith of the Church of Rome from so apparently
 weak a foundation, there can be no greater strength in his testimony than
 there is in the ground on which it is built; and if there be any force in
 this Argument, the Church of Thessalonica will be as *Infallible* as Rome, for
 her Faith is commended rather in a more ample manner by the Apostle 1 Thess. 1. 8.
 than that of Rome is) St. Hierom, I say, referring to that Faith he sup-
 poses the Apostle commended in them, must only be understood of the
 unchangeableness of that first Faith, which appears by the mention of an
 Angel from Heaven Preaching otherwise. Which certainly cannot with any
 tolerable sense be meant thus, that St. Hierom supposed it beyond the
 power of an Angel from Heaven to alter the Faith of the Roman Church. For
 in the very same Apology he expresseth his great fears, lest the Faith of
 the Romans should be corrupted by the Books of Ruffinus. But, say you,
What is this then to Ruffinus, who knew as well as St. Hierom, that Faith
could not change its essence? However, though St. Hierom should here
 speak of the Primitive and Apostolical Faith which was then received at
 Rome, that it could receive no alteration; yet this was very pertinent to
 be told Ruffinus, because St. Hierom charges him with an endeavour to
 subvert the Faith not merely at Rome, but in all other places, by publish-
 ing the Books of Origen with an Encomiastick Preface to them; and there-
 fore the telling him, *The Catholick Faith would admit of no alteration,*
 which was received at Rome as elsewhere, might be an Argument to
 discourage him from any attempts of that nature. And the main charge
 against Ruffinus, is not an endeavour to subvert mere-
 ly the People of Rome, but the Latin Church by his
 translation; and therefore these words ought to be
 taken in their greatest latitude; and so imply not at all any *Infallibility* in
 the Roman See.

*Non ubi sufficit scandalum Græcis, nisi il-
 lud & Latinorum auribus ingeras. Id. ib.*

The remaining Testimonies of Gregory Nazianzene, Cyril, and Ruffinus, P. 136.
 (as appears to any one who reads them) only import that the Roman 137.
 Church had to their time preserved the Catholick Faith; but they do not
 assert it impossible it should ever do otherwise; or that she is an *Infallible*
 preserver of it, and none of their Testimonies are so proper to the Church
 of Rome, but they would equally hold for any other Apostolical Churches
 at that time. Gregory Nazianzene indeed says, *That it would become the*
Church of Rome to hold the entire Faith always: And would it not become
 any other Church to do so too? Doth this import that she shall *Infallibly* do
 it, or rather that it is her duty to do it? And if these then be such pregnant
 Authorities with you, it is a sign there is little or nothing to be found in
 Antiquity for your purpose.

But before we end this Chapter, we are called to a new task on occasion §. 18.
 of a Testimony of St. Cyril produced by his Lordship instead of that in
 Bellarmine which appeared not in that Chapter, where his Name is men-
 tioned.

comes to be *judicially* decided by him ; It is sufficient for us at present to shew that this distinction cannot relieve you in our present case. For your *Doctors* tell us, the *Pope* then errs *personally* and as a *private Doctor*, when he errs only in his *own judgment* without obliging others to believe, what he judges to be *true* ; but then he errs *judicially* and as *Universal Pastor*, when he declares his judgment so as to oblige others to receive it as *true*. Now can any thing be more evident than that *St. Cyprian* judged *Pope Stephen* to err in this latter, and not in the former sense ? For doth he not absolutely and severely declare himself against *St. Cyprian's Opinion*: Condemning it as an error and an *innovation* ? But say you, *He did not properly define any Doctrine in that Contestation* ; but said *nihil innovetur nisi quod traditum*. But was not that the question what was *traditum* and what not, for *Cyprian* and his Party denied it to be a *Tradition*, which *Stephen* asserted was so ; and doth he not therefore undertake to define something in this cause ? But say you, *If this argument hold good against the Infallibility of Popes, viz. that St. Cyprian held Pope Stephen erred, therefore the Pope may err in matters of Faith ; it will be a good consequence also to say, St. Cyprian held Pope Stephen erred, even whilst he maintained an universal immemorial Tradition—therefore the Pope may err whilst he follows such a Tradition*. I answer, 1. Who besides you, would not have seen, that the question was not, Whether the *Pope* was *Infallible* or no, but whether *St. Cyprian* judged him to be *Infallible* or no ? For if it appear that *St. Cyprian* did not judge him *Infallible*, then those former words cannot be interpreted to such a sense as doth imply *Infallibility*. 2. No doubt if the *Pope* may err in other things, he may err when he thinks he follows an *universal immemorial Tradition* ; not that he doth err, when he doth really follow such a one, but he may err in judging that to be an *universal immemorial Tradition* which is not : And this was the case between *St. Cyprian* and *Pope Stephen* ; the *Pope* pretended to follow an *universal Tradition* ; *St. Cyprian* judgeth him to err in it, and that it was not so. And is it not plain still, notwithstanding these frivolous pretences, that *St. Cyprian* had no opinion at all of the *Pope's Infallibility* in any sense ? And therefore out of honour to him, you are bound to interpret his former words to some other sense than that of any *Infallibility* in the Church of *Rome*. Thus all his Lordship's Answers standing good, you have gained no great matter by this first Testimony of *St. Cyprian*.

The second Authority is out of *S. Hierom*, whose words are, *The*

Attamen scito Romanam fidem Apostolicâ voce laudatam ejusmodi præstigiâs non recipere, etiamsi Angelus aliter annunciet, quàm semel prædicatum est, Pauli auctoritate munitam non posse mutari. Hieron. l. 3. Apol. c. Ruff. cap. 4.

Roman Faith commended by the Apostle, admits not such præstigiâs, deceits and delusions into it, though an Angel should Preach it otherwise than it was Preached at first, being armed and fenced by St. Paul's Authority it cannot be changed. Here you tell us, You willingly agree with his Lordship that by Romanam fidem,

St. Hierom understands the Catholick Faith of Christ, and so you concur with him against Bellarmine, that it cannot be understood of the particular Church of Rome. But by the way you charge your Adversaries, with great inconsequence, that in this place they make Roman and Catholick to be the same, and yet usually condemn you for joyning as Synonyma's Roman and Catholick together. A wonderful want of judgment ! as though the Roman Faith might not be the Catholick Faith then, and yet the Catholick Faith not be the Roman Faith now. The former speech only affirms that the Faith at Rome was truly Catholick ; the latter implies that no Faith can be Catholick but what agrees with Rome : And think you there is no difference

rence

rence between these two? But you say further, *That this Catholick Faith must not here be taken abstractly that so it cannot be changed, for Ruffinus was not ignorant of that, but that it must be understood of the immutable Faith of the See Apostolick, so highly commended by the Apostle and St. Hierom; which is founded upon such a rock, that even an Angel himself is not able to shake it.* But St. Hierom speaking this with a reference to that Faith he supposeth the Apostle commended in them (although the Apostle doth not so much commend the Catholickness or soundness of their Faith as the act of believing in them, and therefore whatever is drawn from thence, whether by St. Hierom or any else can have no force in it; for if he should infer the immutability of the Faith of the Church of Rome from so apparently weak a foundation, there can be no greater strength in his testimony than there is in the ground on which it is built; and if there be any force in this Argument, the Church of Thessalonica will be as *Infalible* as Rome, for her Faith is commended rather in a more ample manner by the Apostle than that of Rome is) St. Hierom, I say, referring to that Faith he supposes the Apostle commended in them, must only be understood of the *unchangeableness* of that first Faith, which appears by the mention of an Angel from Heaven Preaching otherwise. Which certainly cannot with any tolerable sense be meant thus, that St. Hierom supposed it beyond the power of an Angel from Heaven to alter the Faith of the Roman Church. For in the very same Apology he expresth his great fears, lest the Faith of the Romans should be corrupted by the Books of Ruffinus. But, say you, *What is this then to Ruffinus, who knew as well as St. Hierom, that Faith could not change its essence?* However, though St. Hierom should here speak of the *Primitive* and *Apostolical* Faith which was then received at Rome, that it could receive no alteration; yet this was very pertinent to be told Ruffinus, because St. Hierom charges him with an endeavour to subvert the Faith not meerly at Rome, but in all other places, by publishing the Books of Origen with an *Encomiastick* Preface to them; and therefore the telling him, *The Catholick Faith* would admit of no alteration, which was received at Rome as elsewhere, might be an Argument to discourage him from any attempts of that nature. And the main charge against Ruffinus, is not an endeavour to subvert merely the People of Rome, but the *Latin Church* by his translation; and therefore these words ought to be taken in their greatest latitude; and so imply not at all any *Infalibility* in the *Roman See*.

Non tibi sufficit scandalum Græcia, nisi illud & Latinorum auribus ingeras. Id. ib.

The remaining *Testimonies* of Gregory Nazianzene, Cyril, and Ruffinus, (as appears to any one who reads them) only import that the Church had to their time preserved the Catholick Faith; but they do not assert it impossible it should ever do otherwise; or that she is an *Infalible* preserver of it, and none of their *Testimonies* are so proper to the Church of Rome, but they would equally hold for any other *Apostolical* Churches at that time. Gregory Nazianzene indeed says, *That it would become the Church of Rome to hold the entire Faith always:* And would it not become any other Church to do so too? Doth this import that she shall *Infalibly* do it, or rather that it is her duty to do it? And if these then be such pregnant Authorities with you, it is a sign there is little or nothing to be found in *Antiquity* for your purpose.

But before we end this Chapter, we are called to a new task on occasion of a Testimony of St. Cyril produced by his Lordship instead of that in Bellarmine which appeared not in that Chapter, where his Name is mentioned.

tioned. In which he asserts, *That the foundation and firmness which the Church of Christ hath, is placed not in or upon the Person, much less the Successor of St. Peter; but upon the Faith which by God's Spirit in him he so firmly professed: which (saith his Lordship) is the common received opinion both of the ancient Fathers and of the Protestants. Upon this Rock, that is, upon this Faith will I build my Church.* On which occasion you run presently out into that large common place concerning *Tu es Petrus*, and

P. 138. *super hanc Petram*; and although I should grant all that you so earnestly contend for, viz. *That these words are not spoken of St. Peter's Confession, but of his Person*, I know no advantage which will accrue to your cause by it. For although very many of the *Fathers* understand this place of *St. Peter's Confession*, as containing in it the Ground and Foundation of the *Christian Religion*, *Thou art Christ the Son of the Living God*, which therefore may well be said to be the *Rock* on which *Christ* would build his Church, and although it were no matter of difficulty to defend this interpretation from all exceptions; yet because I think it not improbable (the words running by way of address to *St. Peter*) that something peculiar to him, is contained in them, I shall not contend with you about that. But then, if you say that the meaning of *St. Peter's being the Rock*, is, *The constant Infallibility in Faith which was derived from St. Peter to the Church of Rome*, as you seem to suggest, you must remember you have a new task to make good, and it is not saying, *That St. Peter was meant by the Rock*, will come within some leagues of doing it. I pass therefore by that discourse as a thing we are not much concerned in, for it is brought in by his *Lordship* as the last thing out of that testimony of *Cyril*: But you were contented to let go the other more material Observations, that you might more freely expatiate *super hanc Petram*. Touching *Ruffinus*, I grant his Lordship is of opinion, *That he neither did nor could account the Roman*

P. 16. *Church Infallible*, for which he gives this reason, *For if he had so esteemed of it, he would not have dissented from it in so main a point as is the Canon of Scripture, as he plainly doth: For reckoning up the Canonical Books, he most manifestly dissents from the Roman Church. Therefore either Ruffinus did not think the Church of Rome was Infallible, or else the Church of Rome at this day reckons up more Books within the Canon, than heretofore she did. If she do, then she is changed in a main point of Faith, the Canon of Scripture, and is absolutely convinced not to be Infallible; for if she were right in her reckoning then, she is wrong now; and if she be right now, she was wrong then; and if she do not reckon now more than she did, when Ruffinus lived, then he reckons fewer than she, and so dissents from her, which doubtless he durst not have done, had he thought her judgment Infallible. Yea and he sets this mark upon his dissent besides, that he reckons up the Books of the Canon just so, and no otherwise, than as he received them out of the Monuments of the Fore-Fathers, and out of which the assertions of our Faith are to be taken. Now what have you to say to this strong and nervous Discourse of his Lordship? Why (forsooth) this argument of the Bishop is far from being convincing. And why so? For (say you) though it should be granted that the Catholick Church (the Roman you mean) at present declares more Books to be contained in the Canon, than she did in Ruffinus his time, yet this could be no error in her. That is strange that the Church should declare the Canon to be compleat then, without these Books, and now not to be, and yet neither time be in an error! No (say you) unless it be shewed (which I am sure cannot be) that she*

Petræ apud nos per agnitionem nihil aliud, quam inconcussam & firmissimam discipuli fidem vocavit; in qua Ecclesia Christi ita fundata & firmata esset, ut non laberetur, & esset inexpugnabilis inferorum portus, in perpetuum manens. S. Cyril. Alex. Dial. de Trinit. l. 4. p. 278. Paris. A. 1604.

P. 138.
139.

Ruffin. in
Symbol.
p. 188,
189. p.
139.

she condemned those books then as not Divine Scripture, or not Canonical, which now she declares to be Divine or Canonical. Excellent good still! that which you are sure cannot be shewed, is obvious to any one that hath eyes in his head. For I only ask you, Whether the Church of Rome did declare any Canon or no, in that age? If not, according to your principles those who lived in that age could have no Divine Faith as to the Scripture: if she did declare the Canon of Scripture, without these Books, did she not thereby condemn these Books to be not Canonical? For you say, that all are bound to take her judgment what is in the Canon and what not; if therefore she did not put them into the Canon, did she not leave them out of the Canon? or, Can you find any medium between being put in and being left out? Yes (say you) these Books were left then under dispute: with whom were they under dispute? with the Church of Rome or not? If with her, was she not Infallible the mean while, when so great a matter as the Canon of Scripture was under dispute with her? But this whole business concerning the Canon of Scripture is largely discussed already; only here it is sufficient to shew, how you are pent in on every side, so that there is no possibility of getting out.

As to the strait (his Lordship takes notice of) that the Church of Rome is driven to, in borrowing a testimony for her Infallibility from one whom she branded with Heresie in that very Book from whence this testimony is taken; You answer, That it evidently argues the truth and uncorruptedness of that Church, which is so clear that even her Adversaries cannot but confess it. But if they confess it no better than Rufinus doth, she will have little cause to applaud her self for her Integrity in that respect. And although a Testimony may be taken from persons suspected in some things, yet it argues those have but very few friends, who are fain to make use of their enemies to bear witness for them. What follows concerning a particular Church being Infallible, because you disown it (although not consonantly to the principles of your party as was shewed in the occasion of the Conference) I pass by.

P. 140.

The errors of the Church of Rome (which his Lordship mentions, but you say proves not) you shall find abundantly proved before our task is over.

Your vindication of Bellarmine from inconsistency in saying *A proposition is most true, and yet but peradventure as true as another*, is so fine and subtil that it were an injury to the Reader to deprive him of the pleasure of perusing it. And yet when all is done, a Proposition very false might be as true as this which Bellarmine speaks of, viz. *That the Pope when he teacheth the whole Church in matters of Faith cannot err.*

And thus I have cleared that there can be no ground of an imputation of Schism on our Church from hence, that the Roman Church is the Catholick Church, which acceptance of the Catholick Church I have manifested to be as great a stranger to Antiquity as it is an enemy to Reason: And that the calling the Roman Church the Catholick Church, is, (as his Lordship truly saith) a meer Novelty and perfect Jesuitism.

G. P.

tioned. In which he asserts, That the foundation and firmness which the Church of Christ hath, is placed not in or upon the Person, much less the Successor of St. Peter; but upon the Faith which by God's Spirit in him he so firmly professed: which (saith his Lordship) is the common received opinion both of the ancient Fathers and of the Protestants. Upon this Rock, that is, upon this Faith will I build my Church. On which occasion you run presently out into that large common place concerning *Tu es Petrus*, and

P. 138. *super hanc Petram*; and although I should grant all that you so earnestly contend for, viz. That these words are not spoken of St. Peter's Confession, but of his Person, I know no advantage which will accrue to your cause by it. For although very many of the Fathers understand this place of St. Peter's Confession, as containing in it the Ground and Foundation of the Christian Religion, Thou art Christ the Son of the Living God, which therefore may well be said to be the Rock on which Christ would build his Church, and although it were no matter of difficulty to defend this interpretation from all exceptions; yet because I think it not improbable (the words running by way of address to St. Peter) that something peculiar to him, is contained in them, I shall not contend with you about that. But then, if you say that the meaning of St. Peter's being the Rock, is, The constant Infallibility in Faith which was derived from St. Peter to the Church of Rome, as you seem to suggest, you must remember you have a new task to make good, and it is not saying, That St. Peter was meant by the Rock, will come within some leagues of doing it. I pass therefore by that discourse as a thing we are not much concerned in, for it is brought in by his Lordship as the last thing out of that testimony of Cyril: But you were contented to let go the other more material Observations, that you might more freely expatiate *super hanc Petram*. Touching Ruffinus, I grant his Lordship is of opinion, That he neither did nor could account the Roman

P. 16. Church Infallible, for which he gives this reason, For if he had so esteemed of it, he would not have dissented from it in so main a point as is the Canon of Scripture, as he plainly doth: For reckoning up the Canonical Books, he most manifestly dissents from the Roman Church. Therefore either Ruffinus did not think the Church of Rome was Infallible, or else the Church of Rome at this day reckons up more Books within the Canon, than heretofore she did. If she do, then she is changed in a main point of Faith, the Canon of Scripture, and is absolutely convinced not to be Infallible; for if she were right in her reckoning then, she is wrong now; and if she be right now, she was wrong then; and if she do not reckon now more than she did, when Ruffinus lived, then he reckons fewer than she, and so dissents from her, which doubtless he durst not have done, had he thought her judgment Infallible. Yea and he sets this mark upon his dissent besides, that he reckons up the Books of the Canon just so, and no otherwise, than as he received them out of the Monuments of the Fore-Fathers, and out of which the assertions of our Faith are to be taken. Now what have you to say to this strong and nervous Discourse of his Lordship? Why (forsooth) this argument of the Bishop is far from being convincing. And why so? For (say you) though it should be granted that the Catholick Church (the Roman you mean) at present declares more Books to be contained in the Canon, than she did in Ruffinus his time, yet this could be no error in her. That is strange that the Church should declare the Canon to be compleat then, without these Books, and now not to be, and yet neither time be in an error! No (say you) unless it be shewed (which I am sure cannot be) that she

Petram minor per agnominationem nihil aliud, quam inconcussam & firmissimam discipuli fidem vocavit; in qua Ecclesia Christi ita fundata & firmata esset, ut non laberetur, & esset inexpugnabilis inferorum portus, in perpetuum manens. S. Cyril. Alex. Dial. de Trinit. l. 4. p. 278. Paris. A. 1604.

Ruffin. in
Symbol.
p. 188,
189. p.
139.

she condemned those books then as not Divine Scripture, or not Canonical, which now she declares to be Divine or Canonical. Excellent good still! that which you are sure cannot be shewed, is obvious to any one that hath eyes in his head. For I only ask you, Whether the Church of Rome did declare any Canon or no, in that age? If not, according to your principles those who lived in that age could have no Divine Faith as to the Scripture: if she did declare the Canon of Scripture, without these Books, did she not thereby condemn these Books to be not Canonical? For you say, that all are bound to take her judgment what is in the Canon and what not; if therefore she did not put them into the Canon, did she not leave them out of the Canon? or, Can you find any medium between being put in and being left out? Yes (say you) these Books were left then under dispute: with whom were they under dispute? with the Church of Rome or not? If with her, was she not Infallible the mean while, when so great a matter as the Canon of Scripture was under dispute with her? But this whole business concerning the Canon of Scripture is largely discussed already; only here it is sufficient to shew, how you are pent in on every side, so that there is no possibility of getting out.

As to the strait (his Lordship takes notice of) that the Church of Rome is driven to, in borrowing a testimony for her Infallibility from one whom she branded with Heresie in that very Book from whence this testimony is taken; You answer, That it evidently argues the truth and uncorruptedness of that Church, which is so clear that even her Adversaries cannot but confess it. But if they confess it no better than Ruffinus doth, she will have little cause to applaud her self for her Integrity in that respect. And although a Testimony may be taken from persons suspected in some things, yet it argues those have but very few friends, who are fain to make use of their enemies to bear witness for them. What follows concerning a particular Church being Infallible, because you disown it (although not consonantly to the principles of your party as was shewed in the occasion of the Conference) I pass by.

P. 146.

The errors of the Church of Rome (which his Lordship mentions, but you say proves not) you shall find abundantly proved before our task is over.

Your vindication of Bellarmine from inconsistency in saying *A proposition is most true, and yet but peradventure as true as another*, is so fine and subtil that it were an injury to the Reader to deprive him of the pleasure of perusing it. And yet when all is done, a Proposition very false might be as true as this which Bellarmine speaks of, viz. That the Pope when he teacheth the whole Church in matters of Faith cannot err.

And thus I have cleared that there can be no ground of an imputation of Schism on our Church from hence, that the Roman Church is the Catholick Church, which acceptance of the Catholick Church I have manifested to be as great a stranger to Antiquity as it is an enemy to Reason: And that the calling the Roman Church the Catholick Church, is, (as his Lordship truly saith) a meer Novelty and perfect Jesuitism.

G. P.

CHAP. II.

196.15.

Protestants no Schismatics.

Schism a culpable separation; therefore the Question of Schism, must be determined by enquiring into the causes of it. The plea from the Church of Rome's being once a right Church, considered. No necessity of assigning the punctual time when errors crept into her. An account why the originals of errors seem obscure. By Stapleton's confession, the Roman and Catholick Church were not the same. The falsity of that assertion manifested, That there could be no pure Church since the Apostles times, if the Roman Church were corrupt. No one particular Church free from corruptions; yet no separation from the Catholick Church. How far the Catholick Church may be said to err. Men may have distinct communion from any one particular Church, yet not separate from the Catholick Church. The Testimony of Petrus de Alliaco vindicated. Bellarmine not mis-cited. Almain full to his Lordships purpose. The Romanists guilty of the present Schism, and not Protestants. In what sense there can be no just cause of Schism; and how far that concerns our case. Protestants did not depart from the Church of Rome, but were thrust out of it. The Vindication of the Church of Rome from Schism, at last depends upon the two false Principles, Of her Infallibility, and being the Catholick Church. The Testimonies of S. Bernard and S. Austin not to the purpose. The Catalogue of Fundamentals, the Churches not erring, &c. referr'd back to their proper places.

S. 1.

P. 133.
sect. 21.
n. 1.P. 135. n.
3.P. 136.
n. 4.

BEfore I come to examine the particulars of this Chapter, it will be necessary to see, what the state of the Controversie was, concerning Schism, between his Lordship and his Adversary. His Lordship delivers his sense clearly and fully in these words; 'Tis too true indeed, that there is a miserable rent in the Church, and I make no question but the best Men do most bemoan it; nor is he a Christian that would not have Unity, might he have it with Truth. But, I never said, nor thought, that the Protestants made this rent. The cause of the Schism is yours; for you thrust us from you, because we call'd for truth, and redress of abuses. For a Schism must needs be theirs, whose the cause of it is. The woe runs full out of the mouth of Christ ever against him that gives the offence; not against him that takes it ever. And in the Margent, shewing that a separation may sometimes be necessary, he instanceth in the orthodox departing from the communion of the Arrians: upon which he says; It cannot be that a Man should do well in making a Schism. There may be therefore a necessary separation, which yet incurs not the guilt of Schism; and that is, when Doctrines are taught contrary to the Catholick Faith. And after saith, The Protestants did not depart: for, departure is voluntary, so was not theirs; I say not theirs, taking their whole body and cause together. For, that some among them were peevish, and some ignorantly zealous, is neither to be doubted, nor is there danger in confessing it. Your body is not so perfect (I wot well) but that many amongst you are as pettish and as ignorantly zealous as any of ours. You must not suffer for these, nor we for those, nor should the Church of Christ for either. And when A. C. saith, That though the Church of Rome did thrust the Protestants from her by excommunication, yet they had first divided themselves by obstinate holding and teaching Opinions contrary to the Roman Faith. His Lordship answers, So then in his Opinion, Excommunication on their part was not the prime cause of this division

division, but the holding and teaching of contrary Opinions. Why but then in my opinion (saith he) that holding and teaching was not the prime cause neither, but the corruptions and superstitions of Rome, which forced many Men to hold and teach the contrary: So, the prime cause was theirs still. And A. C. ^{P. 141. n. 6.} telling him, That he said that it was ill done of those who first made the separation. He answers, That though he remembered not that he said those words; yet withal adds, If I did not say it then, I do say it now; and most true it is, That it was ill done of those, who're they were, who first made the separation. But then A. C. must not understand me of Actual only, but of Causal separation. For (as I said before) the Schism is theirs, whose the cause of it is: and he makes the separation that gives the first just cause of it; not he that makes an actual separation upon a just cause preceding. And this is so evident a Truth, that A. C. cannot deny it, for he says it is most true. These passages I have laid together, that the Reader may clearly understand the full state of this great Controversie concerning Schism; the upshot of which is, that it is agreed between both parties, that all separation from communion with a Church, doth not involve in it the guilt of Schism, but only such a separation as hath no sufficient cause or ground for it. So that the Question comes to this, Whether your Church were not guilty of such errors and corruptions, as gave sufficient cause for such a separation. The Question being thus stated, we now come to consider how you make good your part in it.

Your first pretence is (if reduced into argument, for you seem to have ^{S. 1.} a particular pique against a close way of disputing) That your Church is a right and orthodox Church, and therefore could never give any just cause of separation from it. For the Lady asked (as A. C. would have it) Whether the Roman Church was not the right Church; not, be not, but, was not; that ^{P. 131. n. 5.} is, relating to the times, before the breach was made. Now his Lordship tells him, That as to the termes he might take his choice; For the Church of Rome neither is, nor was the right Church, as the Lady desired to hear. A particular Church it is, and was, and in some times right, and in some times wrong: but the right Church, or the Holy Catholick Church, it never was, nor ever can be. And therefore was not such before Luther and others left it, or were thrust from it. A particular Church it was; but then A. C. is not distinct enough here neither. For the Church of Rome, both was, and was not a right or orthodox Church before Luther made a breach from it. For the word ante, before, may look upon Rome, and that Church a great way off, or long before; and then in the prime times of it, it was a most right and orthodox Church. But it may look also nearer home, and upon the immediate times, before Luther, or some ages before that: and then in those times Rome was a corrupt and tainted Church, far from being Right. And yet both these times, before Luther made his breach. And so he concludes that Section with this clause, That the Roman Church which was once right, is now become wrong, by embracing superstition and error. And what say you now to all this? Two things you have to return in answer to it, or at least to these two all that you say may be reduced. 1. That if the Roman Church was right once, it is so still. 2. That if the Roman Church were wrong before Luther, the Catholick Church was so too. These two containing all that is said in this case, must be more particularly discussed.

2. That if the Roman was the right Church, it still is so, seeing no change can be shewn in her Doctrine. If there have been a change, let it appear when, and in what the change was made. Thus you say: but you know his Lordship never granted, that the Roman Church ever was the right Church (in the sense you take those words for the true Catholick Church;) that it

was once a *right particular Church* he acknowledged, and as such was afterwards tainted with errors and corruptions. If so, *you desire to know what these were, and when they came in*; to the former I shall reserve an Answer till I come to the third part of my task, where you shall have an account of them; to the latter, *the time when these came in*, because this is so much insisted on by your party, I shall return you an Answer in this place. And that I shall do in these following Propositions.

Mat. 13.
25.

1. *Nothing can be more unreasonable, than to deny, that errors and corruptions have come into a Church, merely because the punctual time of their coming in cannot be assigned.* For, Will any one question the birth of an Infant, because he cannot know the time of his conception? Will any one deny there are tares in the field, because he did not see them sown? and our Saviour hath told us, That the *time of sowing tares by the enemy, was, when the Men were asleep.* So we say, The errors and corruptions of your Church came in, in a time of great *ignorance*, when little notice was taken of them, and few records reserved of those times and all the passages of them. Since Learning and Religion commonly decay and flourish together, How is it possible there should be as exact an account given of the decay of Religion, as of the flourishing of it? Besides, Are there not many things you judge errors and corruptions your selves, which you can give no account when they first entred into the Church? As the necessity of communicating Infants: name us the person who first broached that Doctrine, and the time in which it was first received in the Church? That no souls of Men departed, shall see God till the day of resurrection, is, I suppose, with you an error; yet it would puzzle you to find out the first Author of it. So for the rebaptizing Hereticks, and many things of a like nature, it is easier to shew, when they appeared publicly, than when they first came into the Church. And as evident it is, in the decay of the primitive Discipline of the Church, the altering the orders of penitents, and the rites belonging to them, the leaving off the *communicatory Letters* between Churches, and many other customs of the Church grown into disuse; and yet I suppose you will not presume to name the persons who first altered the former orders of the Church; and methinks, this is as reasonable as the naming the punctual time when other corruptions came in. If you say, the Primitive Discipline decayed gradually and insensibly; so say I, that the Churches corruptions came in as the other went out, in the same gradual and insensible manner; and if you cannot name the precise time of the one, it is not reasonable you should expect the other from us.

2. *We may have sufficient reason to judge what are errors and corruptions in a Church, though we cannot fix on the time when they came in:* Which is, by comparing them with that Rule of Faith which is delivered down by an uninterrupted tradition to us, and with the practice of the first Ages of the Christian Church. What is apparently contrary to either of these, we have reason to reject, tho' we cannot determine when it first came in. For as long as these are our certain standards, it matters not who first departed from them, as long as we see that they have departed. But when we own an absolute and infallible Rule of Faith and manners, to question Whether any thing contrary to it, be an error or no, because we cannot tell when it first began, would be, as if the Egyptians, when they saw their Land overflowed by the Nile, should question, Whether it were so or no, because they could not find out the head of Nilus.

3. *They who assert their Doctrines and Practices to be Apostolical, are bound to shew the continued succession of them from the Apostles times.* And if they fail

fail in this, upon their own Principles, they must be *Errors and Corruptions*, though the *punctual time* of their first obtaining in the Church, cannot be set down. Since therefore you *affirm*, you are bound to *prove*. If you say, The judgment of your Church being infallible, you need prove no more than that. I answer, you must prove that this *Infallibility* then, hath been ever received in the Church; but if there be not the least footstep of it in the Records of the ancient Church, we justly look on this as an *Error* of the first Magnitude, though we cannot tell you the Minute of its first rising.

4. *We have sufficient evidence from your selves, that many Doctrines and Practices are owned by you, which are of no great antiquity in the Christian Church.* Thus, by the confession of *Scotus*, *Transubstantiation* is no elder than the Council of *Lateran*, *Purgatory* not much heard of in the *Primitive Church* by the acknowledgment of *Bishop Fisher*, *Communion in one kind* confessed by most to be contrary to the *Primitive Practice and Institution*, *Prayer in an unknown tongue* can be no elder than the general disuse of the *Latin Tongue* in the *Roman Provinces*. And so for many others, for which we have the Confessions of your own Party; but I need not insist upon that, since your very Doctrine of the Churches power to declare Matters of Faith, may make things necessary in one Age, which were not in a foregoing, and, in that case, sure it is no great difficulty to tell you, when some things of *School points* became necessary *Doctrines*; but then the Question goes off from the time to the matter, Whether any thing declared by your Church can be an *Error*: But of that enough hath been said already.

5. *There may be a sufficient account given, why the beginnings of Errors and Corruptions in your Church have been so obscure, because they came not in all of a sudden, but some at one time, some at another, because they rise gradually, as is apparent in Invocation of Saints, and Worship of Images, because many of those things which ended in great Corruptions, were taken up at first out of good designs, to win more upon the Gentile World, because many things were at first practised freely, which afterwards were urged as necessary, because Barbarism came into the Church along with these Corruptions, because many who gave occasion to them, were Persons of great esteem in their age, and others strove to follow their example more than the Rule, because the State of the Church did very much alter from it self in several Ages, which altered Mens apprehensions and judgments of things, in regard of their suitability and necessity; because those Persons who brought in, and contended for these things, were the Persons chiefly in power then in the Church, which hindered their being cast out of Communion as others had been; because a long time most of these errors and corruptions, were but the private opinions and practices of a Faction, though then the more prevalent in the Church, and therefore not so vehemently opposed in the first rise of them, as when this imposthumated matter was grown to a head, and then there was a necessity of lancing it. These, and several other reasons might be given, why the first originals of Errors and Corruptions in your Church, cannot with so much clearness be manifested, as that they were Errors and Corruptions: Although such, who would take the pains to travel in an argument of that nature, might with very great probability, trace the most both of your Errors and Corruptions to the Time and Age, when they were first publicly owned and received. But thus much may here suffice as to your demand, That if your Church be not the same she was, we should mention the time, when the change was made. As though Chronical Distempers could not be known, unless we could set down the punctual time of their*
first

first onset. The distempers of your Church are *Hætical*, I wish not in that respect, that they are *seldom fully discovered, till they be incurable*.

S. 3. 2. You answer, *That if your Church hath erred, the Catholick Church hath done so too*; for which you say two things, 1. *That in this dispute the Roman Church, and the Catholick Church, are all one.* 2. *That then there was no one visible Church untainted, uncorrupt, right, orthodox throughout the whole World.*
 P. 142. n. 1. 1. You learnedly tell us, *That the Roman and Catholick Church are all one in this Dispute*, and most discreetly tell his Lordship, *That he begs the Question in supposing the contrary*; but you know whose arts those are to charge their Neighbours with that, they were sure to be told of themselves, if the other had spoke first. But very worthily you prove this, from D. Stapleton, who offers to confirm his assertion by that which overthrows yours. He says, *That amongst the Ancients, the Roman Church, and the Catholick Church were taken for the same, and his reason is, because the Communion of the Roman Church was most certainly and evidently with the whole Catholick.* And, Can any thing then be more plain, than that the Roman and Catholick Church were not the same? For, Can any thing be the measure of it self? If it were therefore Catholick, because agreeing with the Catholick Church, then it was not *causally* the Catholick Church, but only by way of Communion and Participation. If I should say, That a Man and a Living-creature are the same, and should give this reason for it, because Man agrees in every thing with the nature of a Living-creature; doth this imply, that the formal notion of Man, and a Living-creature, are the same? Or only that Man partakes so much of the properties of a Living-creature, that he may well receive the denomination? So it is here with the Roman Church, that might well be called Catholick by the Ancients, because it did partake of the properties of the Catholick Church, but not as though the formal Reason of a Churches being Catholick, came from partaking of Communion with the Roman Church; as you assert, wherein you are diametrically opposite to Stapleton, for he makes the reason, why the Roman Church was Catholick, to be, because it had Communion with the Catholick Church. By which it is evident, that the notion of the Catholick Church was much larger than that of the Roman Church. Besides, Stapleton only saith, *That the Ancients thought so*, and surely they thought so only of the Roman Church of their own time; which might then have certain Communion with the Catholick Church, and yet not have so in the next Age ensuing; therefore though the Catholick Church continue ever the same, and incorrupt, it will by no means follow, that the Roman Church must do so too. Whatever A. C. or you understand by the Catholick Church, is not, as you elsewhere phrase it, a *straws matter*, unless you proved better than you have done, that the proper notion of the Holy Catholick Church, is the same with those who agree with the Church of Rome in Doctrine and Communion. Which is your fundamental mistake, and a thing you would fain have taken for granted, without the least shadow of a solid proof.

S. 4. But there may be more force in your second Answer, *That if the Ro-*
 P. 143. *man Church were wrong and corrupted, it follows, that not only for some time, but for many Ages before Luther, yea even up to the Apostles times, there was no one visible Church untainted, uncorrupt, right, orthodox throughout the whole World.* It were worth our while to know what you mean by *no one visible Church*; Do you think they are, or may be, more visible Churches than one, taking the visible Church in its proper sense for the Catholick visible Church; If this be your meaning in general, how unhappily soever it be expressed, viz. *that then it follows, there could be no visible Church at*

all with whom we might have Communion; I see not how it is proved by what you bring: But if this be all you aim at (for no further your Arguments will carry you) that there was no one visible Church untainted, i. e. no one Church of a distinct Communion from other Churches altogether free from error; I see no such dangerous consequence in the owning it. But if it were so, when Luther began to oppose the Corruptions of the Church of Rome, How doth it follow that it must be so even up to the Apostles times? But we ought to see, how you prove your assertion. For if in all those Ages the Roman Church were wrong, corrupted, and tainted; and all those likewise that disagreed from her, viz. Hussites, Albigenes, Waldenses, Wicklevites, Greeks, Abyssins, Armenians, &c. had in them corrupt Doctrine during those Ages (as 'tis certain they had; neither could the Relator deny it) I say, If the Roman Church was thus corrupt; it follows, that not only for some time, but for many Ages before Luther, yea even up to the Apostles times, there was no one Visible Church untainted, incorrupt, right, and orthodox, throughout the whole World. And consequently, that during the said Ages, every good Christian was in conscience obliged in some point of Christian belief or other, to contradict the Doctrine, and desert the Communion of all Visible Churches in the World, &c. Whence it would further follow, that Schism or Separation from the external Communion of the whole Church might be not only lawful, but even necessary; which is impossible, as being contrary to the very essential predicates of Schism, which is defined to be, A voluntary or wilful departure (such as no just cause, or reason, can be given of it) from the Communion of the whole Church. Three things this Discourse of yours may be resolved into.

1. That if in Luther's time the Roman Church was corrupt, then there was no one visible Church uncorrupt. 2. That if so, it follows that there was none uncorrupt even up to the Apostles times. 3. That if there were no one Visible Church uncorrupt, then it was necessary to separate from the external Communion of the whole Church: To every one of these I shall return a peculiar and distinct Answer. To the first I say, That the utmost you can prove from hence, is, That there was no one Church of any distinct Communion from others, which was free from all errors. And what great absurdity is there in saying so? Unless you could prove, that there must be some one Church in all Ages of the World, which must be free from all kind or possibility of error. And when you have done this, I shall acknowledge it absurd to say the contrary; but otherwise that very supposition seems to have the greater absurdity in it; because it restrains the utmost supposable privileges of the truly Catholick Church, to a particular Church of some one denomination. What then if we grant that in Luther's time, there was no one Visible Church free from errors and corruptions? What if we should say, in our own times? What if, in elder times? For that which is possible to be, may be supposed actually in any time. If it be possible for one particular Church to fall into Errors and Corruptions, Why is it not for another? (unless some particular privilege of Infallibility be pretended; but that is not our present Question) If it be possible for every particular Church to fall into error, Why may not that possibility come into act in one Age, as well as several? Is there any promise that there shall be a succession and course of erring in Churches, that one Church must err for one Age, and another for the next? But that it shall never fall out, that by any means whatsoever they shall err together? If there be no such promise to the contrary, the reason of the thing will hold, that they may all err at the same time. No, say you, for then it would follow, that the Catholick Church might err. To that I answer, 1. Either you mean by that, that all Societies in the Christian World

World may concur in the same error, or else that several of them may have several errors; and this latter is it only which you prove, for you do not suppose that the *Romanists, Hussites, Albigenes, &c.* were all guilty of the same errors, but that these several Societies were guilty of several errors; and therefore from hence it follows not, that they may all concur in the same error, which is the only way to prove that the *Church as Catholick* may err, for otherwise you only prove, that the several particular Churches, which make up the *Catholick*, may fall into error. 2. Supposing all these Churches should agree in one error (which is more than you have proved, or, it may be, can) have you proved that they concur in such an error, which destroys the Being of the *Catholick Church*? For you would do well to evince, that the Church is secured from any but such errors which destroy its Being; for the means of proving, That the *Catholick Church* cannot err, are built on the promises of its perpetuity; now those can only prove that the Church is secured from *Fundamental Errors*, for those are such only which destroy its Being. And so his Lordship tells you,

P. 139. sect.
18. n. 5.

That the whole Church cannot universally err in the Doctrine of Faith, is most true, and granted by divers Protestants (so you will but understand its not erring in absolute Fundamental Doctrines) and this he proves, from that promise of Christ, That the Gates of Hell shall not prevail against it. So that the Catholick Church's not erring, and the perpetuity of the Catholick Church do with us, mean the same thing. For his Lordship grants, *That she may err in superstructures and deductions, and other By, and unnecessary Truths, if her curiosity, or other weakness, carry her beyond, or cause her to fall short of her Rule.* There is then a great difference between saying, *That the Catholick Church cannot err*, which is no more than to say, *That there shall be always a Catholick Church*, and saying, *That there must be always some one Visible Church*, which must be free from all Error and Corruption. For this we deny, and you produce no reason at all to prove it. Granting, that all particular Churches, whether of *Romanists, Greeks, or others*, are subject to Errors and Corruptions, we assert no more of them, than you grant your selves, that any particular Church is subject to; for the only ground why you would have your Church exempt from error, is, the supposing her not to be a particular, but the *Catholick Church*, which implies, that if she were only a particular Church (as she is no more) she might be subject to errors as well as other Churches. And what incongruity then there is in asserting, that there may be *no one visible Church* of any particular denomination free from all Error and Corruption, I cannot understand.

s. 5.

But further, you say, *If there were no one Visible Church then free from error, it follows, not only for some time, but for many Ages before Luther, yea even up to the Apostles times, there was no one Visible Church untainted throughout the whole World.* Not to meddle with the truth of the thing, Whether there were so or no, the consequence is that, we are now to examine, that if it were so in *Luther's time*, it must be so even up to the *Apostles times*. The proof of which depends upon the impossibility of a Churches degeneracy in Faith or Manners, and so supposeth the thing in question, that there must be some *one visible Church* absolutely exempt from all impossibility of Error. For otherwise that might be true in one Age, which might not in another. For although we say, that particular Churches may err, and be corrupt, we do not say, that it is necessary they should always be so. For, in some Age particular Churches may be free from error and corruption, and yet in another Age be overspread with them. And thus we assert it to have been with the *Roman Church*: For his Lordship saith, *In the prime times*

Times it was a most right and orthodox Church, but in the immediate Times before Luther, or in some Ages before that it was a corrupt and tainted Church: And so in those Times in which it was right, those might be heretical who did not communicate with it, not meerly because they did not communicate with it, but because in not communicating with a *right and orthodox Church* they shewed themselves guilty of some *Error or Corruption*. We see then, there is no Connexion in the World in the Parts of your Consequence, *That if it were so at one Time, it must be so always; if in the Time of Luther, it must be so even up to the Apostles Times.*

3. From hence you say it will follow, *That it will be necessary to separate from the external Communion of the whole Church.* I answer, there can be no Separation from *the whole Church*, but in such Things wherein the *Unity* of the *whole Church* lies; for *Separation* is a Violation of some *Union*: Now when Men separate from the *Errours* of all particular *Churches*, they do not separate from *the Whole*, because those Things which one separates from those particular *Churches* for, are not such, as make all them put together to be the *Whole*, or *Catholick Church*. This must be somewhat further explained. There are two Things considerable in all particular *Churches*; those Things which belong to it as a *Church*, and those Things which belong to it as a *particular Church*. Those Things which belong to it as a *Church*, are the common *Ligaments* or *Grounds of Union* between all particular *Churches*, which taken together, make up the *Catholick Church*: Those Things which belong to it as a *particular Church*, are such as it may retain the *Essence* of a *Church* without. Now, I say, Whosoever separates from any particular *Church* (much more from all) for such Things without which that can be no *Church*, separates from the *Communion* of the *Catholick Church*; but he that separates only from particular *Churches* as to such Things which concern not their *Being*, is only separated from the *Communion* of those *Churches*, and not the *Catholick*. And therefore, supposing that all particular *Churches* have some *Errours* and *Corruptions* in them, though I should separate from *them all*, I do not separate from the *Communion* of the *whole Church*, unless it be for something, without which those could be no *Churches*. An Evidence of which, is, That by my declaring the *Grounds* of my Separation to be such *Errours* and *Corruptions*, which are crept into the *Communion* of such *Churches*, and imposed on me in order to it, I withal declare my Readiness to joyn with them again, if those *Errours* and *Corruptions* be left out. And where there is this Readiness of *Communion*, there is no absolute Separation from the *Church* as such, but only *suspending Communion* 'till such *Abuses* be reformed. Which is therefore more properly a *Separation* from the *Errours*, than the *Communion* of such a *Church*. Wherefore, if we suppose, That *there is no one visible Church* whose *Communion* is not tainted with some *Corruptions*, tho' if these *Corruptions* be enjoyned as *Conditions* of *Communion*, I cannot communicate with any of those *Churches*, yet it follows not, that I am separated from the *external Communion of the Catholick Church*, but that I only *suspend Communion* with those particular *Churches* 'till I may safely joyn with them. As, Suppose all the particular Men I can converse with, were infected with *Leprosie*, my not associating with them, doth not imply that I am separated from the *Communion* of all Mankind, but that I am loth to be infected as they are, and therefore withdraw my self 'till I can meet with such healthful Persons with whom I may safely associate again. And if several other Persons be of the same Mind with me, and we therefore joyn together, Do we therefore divide our selves from the whole World by only taking Care of our own Safety? And especially if any

Company of such leprous Persons should resolve, That none should live among them, but such as would eat of those Meats which brought that Distemper upon them; our withdrawing our selves, and associating without them will still appear more reasonable and commendable. Therefore we say, We do not necessarily separate from all Churches that have Errours or Corruptions in them, supposing those Errours and Corruptions be not imposed on us, as Conditions of Communion; and thence, tho' we should grant No one visible Church free from Taint or Corruption, yet it is not necessary we should separate from them all: For we may lawfully joyn in Communion with Churches having Errours and Corruptions, if our joyning be not an Approbation of them. Thus tho' the Greeks, Armenians, Albigenes, Abyssins may have some Errours and Corruptions, yet if they be not Fundamental, and be not enjoined as necessary to be approved in order to their Communion, notwithstanding them, we may lawfully communicate with them. It doth not then at all follow, That if there may be no one visible Church free from Errour and Corruption, it would be necessary to separate from the Communion of the Catholick Church: Because, 1. All those particular Churches may not make those Errours Conditions of Communion. 2. Tho' they did, we separate not from them as Catholick, but as corrupt and erroneous particular Churches. And therefore you might have spared your Labour in telling us from the Holy Fathers, and the Reverend and Learned Dr. Hammond, That it can never be lawful to separate from the Catholick Church, for we assert the same, but have made it appear, that it follows not from the Premises which were laid down.

¶ 6.

His Lordship having said, That the Roman Church before Luther was a corrupt and tainted Church, in his Margin produceth a Citation to that Purpose of Cardinal de Alliaco, who acknowledgeth Infinite

Cum infiniti Abusus, Schismata quoque & Hereses, per totum nunc Christianum Orbem invalescant; Ecclesiam Dei legitimam indigere Reformatione, nemini non apertum erit. Petrus de Alliaco, lib. de Reform. Eccles.

Abuses, Schisms and Hereses to prevail over the Christian World; so that it is plain, The Church of God stands in need of due Reformation. From which his Lordship saith,

That it will hardly sink into any Man's Judgment that so great a Man as Pet. de Alliaco was in that Church, should speak thus, if he did not see some Errours in the Doctrine of that Church, as well as the Manners. To

P. 143.

this you answer, That he speaks not of false Doctrines taught by the Roman Church, but of Schisms and Heresies raised against the Church (not fostered by her) in all Parts of Christendom. But I appeal to any indifferent Reader of this Testimony, Whether he can conceive that the Cardinal intended to acquit or accuse the Roman Church in those Words of his. For taking them in your Sense, they must contain a high Commendation of the Roman Church, that in the midst of so many Heresies and Schisms raised against her, she preserved her Faith entire; and think you that he that said, The Church of God needed Reformation, thought there was nothing in the Church which stood in need of it? And therefore this Testimony doth sufficiently prove that the Roman Church was a tainted and corrupted Church.

If there be sufficient Evidence, That there are Tares sown in the Church of Rome, it is not to much Purpose to enquire, Whether they were sown while the Bishops slept? or, Whether they themselves did not help to sow them. But it seems in their private Capacities they might sow them, as private Doctors, and then it is not likely that in their publick Capacity they would pluck them up. If the Catholick Faith only, as you tell us, oblige us to maintain that the Pope is Infallible when he defines a General Council; then there will be Opportunity enough for Errours to be sown and grow up in the Interval of such Definitions. But you further add, That tho' this be all which Men are obliged to maintain (for

no

no Man can be bound to Impossibilities) yet that it is a very pious Opinion to hold, That no Popes have personally erred as private Doctors, i. e. You have a very good mind to maintain it, if you knew how; for that is the Meaning of your pious Opinion. For if you thought it had been defensible, no doubt it had been *de Fide* long ago. But it was hard thwarting the Records of former Ages, wherein the *Errours of Popes*, and their mutual *Contradictions* are so visible to all that search after them, and therefore it was wisely concluded that this should not be held *de Fide*, but if any would venture upon a Thing so acceptable at Rome as *personal Infallibility* is, it should be accounted a very pious Undertaking. And accordingly *Bellarmino* hath with the greatest Care and Industry endeavour'd it in several Chapters; but, as his Lordship truly saith, *All Bellarmine's Labour, tho' great and full of Art, is not able to wash them clean.* And this (if you had undertaken the Defence of *Bellarmino*) should have been made good; but since you are so cautious as not to think your self obliged to do it, I commend your Discretion in it, and proceed. I cannot see that his Lordship is guilty of a false Quotation of *Bellarmino* for that Saying, *Et Papas quosdam graves Errores seminasse in Ecclesiâ Christi, Luce clarius est*, for he doth not seem at all to cite *Bellarmino* for it; but having cited the Place just before, where he endeavours to vindicate the Popes from all Errours; he adds this Expression, as directly contrary to his Design, that tho' he had endeavoured so much to clear them from Errours, yet that they had sown some grievous Errors in the Church was as clear as the Day; and as it immediately follows is proved by *Jac. Almain*, &c. And therefore it was only your own Oscitancy which made you set it in the Contents of your Chapter, *That Cardinal Bellarmine was most falsely quoted by him.* But that Falseness which with so much Confidence you charge his Lordship with, rebounds with greater Force on your self, when you say, *That Almain speaks not of Errors in Faith at all, but only of Errours, or rather Abuses in Point of Manners*; whereas he not only asserts but largely proves, *That the Pope may err, not only personally, but judicially*, and in the same Chapter brings that remarkable Instance of the evident Contradiction between the Definitions of Pope *Nicolaus III.* and *John XXII.* And *Platina* tells us, *That John XXII. declared them to be Hereticks who held according to the former Definition.* And is this only concerning some Abuses in point of Manners, and not concerning Errours in Faith that *Almain* speaks? You might as well say so of *Lyra*, who said, *That many Popes have apostatized from the Faith*; of *Cusanus*, who saith, *That both in a direct and collateral Line, several Popes have fallen into Heresie*; of *Alphonfus à Castro*, who saith, *That the best Friends of the Popes believe they may err in Faith*; of *Carranza*, who says, *No one questions but the Pope may be an Heretick*; of *Canus*, who says, *It is not to be denied but that the chief Bishop may be an Heretick, and that there are Examples of it*: You might as well, I say, affirm that all these spake only of Abuses in Manners, and not Errours in Faith, as you do of *Almain*. Neither will your other Subterfuge serve your turn, *That they taught Errours in Doctrine as private Men*; for, *Alphonfus à Castro* expressly affirms in the Case of Pope *Cælestine*, about the Dissolution of Marriage in Case of Heresie, *That it cannot be said that he erred thro' Negligence, and as a private Person, and not as Pope*; For (saith he) *this Definition is extant in the Decretals, and he had seen it himself.* Although the contrary to this were afterwards defined not only by Pope *Innocent III.* but by the Council of *Trent*. And hence it appears,

Papa potest errare, errore judiciali; de personali omnibus notum est. Jac. Almain. de Auctorit. Eccles. cap. 10.
Quorum unus determinavit, judicialiter, Christum & Apostolos nihil habuisse in communi nec in proprio; alter, oppositum. Id. ib.

Lyra in Matth. 16. *Cusan.* Concord. 1. 1. c. 12. *Alphonf.* c. Hæres. 1. 1. c. 2. *Carranz.* Controv. 4. *Canus* loc. Com. 1. 6. c. ult.

De Hæres. 1. 1.

P. 144.

whatever you pretend to the contrary, *That there may be Tares sown in the Church of Rome, not only by private Persons, but by the publick Hands of the Popes too*, if they themselves may be believed, who else do most infallibly contradict each other. But whether these Errours came in at first thro' Negligence or publick Definitions is not so material to our Purpose; for which it is sufficient to prove, That the Church of Rome may be tainted and corrupted, which may be done one way as well as the other. As Corn Fields may be over-run with Tares, tho' no one went purposely to sow them there. And so much is acknowledged by *Cassander*, when he speaks of the superstitious Practices used in your Church, *That those who should have redressed those Abuses, were, if not the Authors, yet the Encouragers of them for their own Advantage*; by which Means, Errours and Corruptions may soon grow to a great Height in a Church tho' they were never sown by publick Definitions. And when you disparage *Cassander's* Testimony, by telling us how little his Credit is among Catholicks, you thereby let us see how much your Church is over-run with Corruptions, when none among you can speak against them, but they presently forfeit their Reputation.

Cassand. Consult. art. 21.

N. 3.

The Case of the *Schism* at Rome between *Cornelius* and *Novatianus*, and the Employment of *Caldonius* and *Fortunatus* from St. *Cyprian* thither, doth belong to the former Chapter, where it hath been fully discoursed of already, and must not be repeated here. Only thence we see, That Rome is as capable of a *Schism* within her own Bowels as any other Church is, which is abundantly attested by the Multitudes of *Schisms*; which happened afterwards between the Bishops of that Sec. But this being insisted on by his Lordship in the former Controversy of the *Catholick Church*, doth not refer to this Chapter, wherein the Causes of our Separation should be enquired into.

Q. 7.
N. 4. *ibid.*

Which at last you come to, and passing by the verbal Dispute between A. C. and his Lordship about what was spoken at the Conference, you tell us, *It more concerns you to see what could or can be said in this Point*. You draw up therefore a large and formal Charge of *Schism* against us in your following Words: *Our Assertion*, say you, *is*; but, good Sir, it is not what you assert, but what you prove. It were an easie Matter for us to draw up a far larger Bill against your Church, and tell you *Our Assertion is*, That you are the greatest *Schismatics* in the World. Would you look on it as sufficiently proved because we asserted it? I pray think the same of us, for we are not apt to think ourselves guilty of *Schism* at all the more, because you tell us what your *Assertion is*. If this be your Way of Dealing with us, your first *Assertion* had need be, That you are Infallible; but still that had need be more than asserted, for unless it be infallibly proved we should not believe it. But however, we must see what your *Assertion is*, that we may at least understand from you the State of the present Controversy. Your *Assertion* therefore is, *That Protestants made this Rent or Schism, by their obstinate and pertinacious maintaining erroneous Doctrines, contrary to the Faith of the Roman or Catholick Church: By their rejecting the Authority of their lawful Ecclesiastical Superiors both immediate and mediate: By aggregating themselves into a separate Body or Company of pretended Christians, independent of any Pastors at all, that were in lawful and quiet Possession of Jurisdiction over them: By making themselves Pastors and Teachers of others, and administering Sacraments without Authority given them by any that were lawfully impow'd to give it: By instituting new Rites and Ceremonies of their own in Matter of Religion, contrary to those anciently received throughout all Christendom: By violently excluding and dispossessing other Prelates and Pastors of and from their respective Sees, Cures and Benefices:*

P. 145.

Benefices ; and intruding themselves into their Places in every Nation where they could get footing, the said Prelates and Pastors for the most part yet living. These are your Assertions, and because you seek not to prove them, it shall be sufficient to oppose ours to them. Our Assertion therefore is, that the Church and Court of Rome are guilty of this Schism, by obtruding erroneous Doctrines and superstitious Practices, as the Conditions of her Communion; by adding such Articles of Faith which are contrary to the plain Rule of Faith, and repugnant to the Sense of the truly Catholick and not the Roman Church; by her intolerable Incroachments and Usurpations upon the Liberties and Privileges of particular Churches, under a vain Pretence of Universal Pastorship; by forcing Men if they would not damn their Souls by sinning against their Consciences in approving the Errours and Corruptions of the Roman Church, to joyn together for the Solemn Worship of God according to the Rule of Scripture and Practice of the Primitive Church; and suspending Communion with that Church till those Abuses and Corruptions be redressed. In which they neither deny Obedience to any Lawful Authority over them, nor take to themselves any other Power than the Law of God hath given them, receiving their Authority in a constant Succession from the Apostles: they institute no Rites and Ceremonies either contrary to, or different from the Practice of the Primitive Church; they neither exclude or dispossess others of their Lawful Power, but in case others neglect their Office, they may be notwithstanding obliged to perform theirs in order to the Churches Reformation. Leaving the Supreme Authority of the Kingdom or Nation to order and dispose of such Things in the Church which of right appertain unto it. And this we assert to be the Case of Schism, in reference to the Church of England, which we shall make good in opposition to your Assertions, where we meet with any thing that seems to contradict the whole or any part of it. These and the like Practices of yours (to use your own Words) not any obstinate maintaining any erroneous Doctrines, as you vainly pretend, we aver to have been the true and real Causes of that Separation which is made between your Church and ours. And you truly say, That Protestants were thrust out of your Church; which is an Argument they did not voluntarily forsake the Communion of it, and therefore are no Schismatics; but your Carriage and Practices were such as forced them to join together in a distinct Communion from you. And it was not we who left your Church, but your Church that left her Primitive Faith and Purity in so high a manner, as to declare all such excommunicate who will not approve of and join in her greatest Corruptions, though it be sufficiently manifest that they are great Receptions from the Faith, Piety, and Purity of that Roman Church which was planted by the Apostles, and had so large a Commendation from the Apostolical Men of those first Ages. Since then such Errors and Corruptions are enforced upon us as Conditions of Communion with you, by the same reason that the Orthodox did very well in departing from the Arians, because the Arians were already departed from the Church by their false Doctrine; will our Separation from you be justified who first departed from the Faith and Purity of the Primitive Church; and not only so, but thrust out of your Communion all such as would not depart from it as far as you.

Having thus considered and retorted your Assertions, we come to your Answers. Nor (say you) does the Bishop vindicate the Protestant Party, by saying, *The Cause of Schism was ours, and that we Catholics thrust Protestants from us, because they call'd for Truth and redress of Abuses. For first, there can be no just cause of Schism; this hath been granted already, even by Protestants.*

§. 8.

P. 145.

stants. And so it is by us, and the reason is very evident for it, for if there be a *just cause*, there can be no *Schism*, and therefore what you intend by this, I cannot imagine, unless it be to free *Protestants* from the guilt of *Schism*, because they put the Main of their Tryal upon the Justice of the *cause* which moved them to forsake the Communion of your *Church*; or else you would have it taken for granted that ours was a *Schism*, and thence infer there could be no *just cause* of it. As if a Man being accused for taking away the Life of one who violently set upon him in the High way with an Intent both to rob and destroy him, should plead for himself that this could be no murder in him, because there was a sufficient and justifiable Cause for what he did; that he designed nothing but to go quietly on his road; that this Person and several others violently set upon him; that he intreated them to desist, that he sought to avoid them as much as he could, but when he saw they were absolutely bent on his Ruine, he was forced in his own necessary Defence to take away the Life of that Person; Would not this with any intelligent Jury be looked on as a just and reasonable Vindication? But if so wise a Person as your self had been among them, you would no doubt have better informed them; for you would very gravely have told them, All his Plea went on a false Supposition, that he had a *just cause* for what he did, but there could be no *just cause* for Murder. Do you not see now how subtil and pertinent your Answer is here, by this parallel to it? For as in that Case all Men grant that there can be no *just cause* for Murder, because all Murder is committed without a just Cause; and if there be one, it ceaseth to be Murder: So it is here in *Schism*, which being a *causeless Separation* from the *Churches Unity*, I wonder who ever imagined there could be *just cause* for it. But to rectifie such gross Mistakes as these are for the future, you would do well to understand that *Schism* formally taken always imports something criminal in it, and there can be no just Cause for a *sin*; but besides that, there is that which (if you understand it) you would call the *materiality* of it, which is the *Separation* of one part of the *Church* from another. Now this, according to the different grounds and reasons of it, becomes *lawful* or *unlawful*, that is, as the reasons do make it necessary or unnecessary; For Separation is not *lawful* but when it is *necessary*: now this being capable of such a different Nature, that it may be *good* or *evil* according to its Circumstances, there can be no absolute Judgment passed upon it, till all those Reasons and Circumstances be duly examined; and if there be no sufficient Grounds for it, then it is *formally Schism*, *i. e.* a culpable Separation; if there be sufficient Cause, then there may be a *Separation*, but it can be no *Schism*. And because the *Union* of the *Catholic Church* lies in *Fundamental* and *necessary Truths*, therefore there can be no Separation absolutely from the *Catholic Church* but what involves in it the formal guilt of *Schism*; it being impossible any Person should have just Cause to disown the *Churches* Communion for any thing whose Belief is necessary to Salvation. And whosoever doth so, thereby makes himself no Member of the *Church*, because the *Church* subsists on the Belief of *Fundamental Truths*. But in all such Cases wherein a Division may be made, and yet the several Persons divided retain the *Essentials* of a *Christian Church*, the Separation which may be among any such, must be determined according to the Causes of it. For it being possible of one side, that Men may out of capricious Humours and Fancies renounce the Communion of a *Church* which requires nothing but what is just and reasonable; and it being possible on the other side, that a *Church* calling her self

Catholic

Catholick may so far degenerate in Faith and Practice, as not only to be guilty of great Errors and Corruptions, but to impose them as Conditions of Communion with her, it is necessary where there is a manifest Separation to enquire into the Reasons and Grounds of it; and to determine the Nature of it according to the Justice of the Cause which is pleaded for it. And this I hope may help you a little better to understand, what is meant by such, who say, *There can be no just cause of Schism*; and how little this makes for your Purpose.

But you go on and I must follow. *And to his calling for Truth, &c. I Answer, What Hereticks ever yet forsook the Church of God, but pretended Truth, and complained they were thrust out, and hardly dealt with, meerly because they called for Truth and redress of Abuses? And I pray, what Church was ever so guilty of Errors and Corruptions, but would call those Hereticks and Schismatics who found fault with her Doctrine, or separated from her Communion? It is true, Hereticks pretend Truth, and Schismatics Abuses, but is it possible there should be Errors and Corruptions in a Churches Communion, or is it not? If not, prove but that of your Church, and the Cause is at an end; if it be, we are to examine whether the charge be true or no. For although Hereticks may pretend Truth, and others be deceived in judging of it, yet doubtless there is a real Difference between Truth and Error. If you would never have men quarrel with any Doctrine of your Church because Hereticks have pretended Truth: would not the same Reason hold, why men should never enquire after Truth, Reason or Religion, because Men have pretended to them all which have not had them. It is therefore a most senseless Cavil to say we have no reason to call for Truth because Hereticks have done so; and on the same Grounds you must not be called Catholics because Hereticks have been called so. But those who have been Hereticks were first proved to be so, by making it appear that was a certain Truth which they denied; do you the same by us; prove those which we call Errors in your Church to be part of the Catholic and Apostolick Faith; prove those we account Corruptions, to be parts of Divine Worship, and we will give you leave to call us Hereticks and Schismatics, but not before. But, say you, He should have reflected that the Church of God is styled a City of Truth by the Prophet, and so it may be, and yet your Church be a Fortrefs of Error) And a Pillar and Foundation of Truth by the Apostle, (but what is this to the Church of Rome's being so?) And by the Fathers, a rich Depository or Treasury of all Divine and Heavenly Doctrines (so it was in the sense the Fathers took the Church in, for the truly Catholic Christian Church). And we may use the same Expressions still of the Church as the Prophets, Apostles, and Fathers did, and nevertheless charge your Church justly with the want of Truth, and opposition to the preaching of it, and on that ground justly forsake her Communion, which is so far from being inexcusable Impiety and Presumption, that it was only the Performance of a necessary Christian Duty. And therefore that Woe of Scandal, his Lordship mentioned, still returns upon your Party who gave such just Cause of Offence to the Christian World, and making it necessary for all such as aimed at the Purity of the Christian Church to leave your Communion, when it could not be enjoyed without making Shipwrack both of Faith and a good Conscience. And this is so clear and undeniable (to follow you still in your own Language) that we dare appeal for a Tryal of our Cause to any Assembly of learned Divines, or what Judge and Jury you please, provided they be not some of the Parties accused; and because you*

p. 9.

are

are so willing to have *learned Divines*, I hope you will believe the last Pope *Innocent* so far, as not to mention the Pope and Cardinals.

P. 146.

What follows in Vindication of *A. C.* from *interfering and shuffling in his Words*, because *timorous and tender Consciences think they can never speak with Caution enough, for fear of telling a Lye*, will have the Force of a Demonstration (being spoken of and by a Jesuit) among all those who know what mortal Haters they are of any Thing that looks like a Lye or Equivocation: And what Reason there is that, of all Persons in the World, they should be judged *Men of timorous and tender Consciences*.

§. 10.

But whatever the Words were which passed, you justify *A. C.* in saying, *That the Protestants did depart from the Church of Rome, and got the Name of Protestants by protesting against her. For this (say you) is so apparent that the whole World acknowledgeth it.* If you mean that the Communion of Protestants is distinct from yours, Who ever made scruple of confessing it? But because in those Terms of *departing, leaving, forsaking* your Communion, you would seem to imply that it was a *voluntary Act*, and done without any necessary Cause enforcing it, therefore his Lordship denies, *That Protestants did depart*; for, saith he, *Departure is voluntary, so was not theirs.* But because it is so hard a Matter to explain the Nature of that Separation between your Church and ours, especially in the Beginning of it, without using those Terms or some like them, as when his Lordship saith, *That Luther made a Breach from it*; It is sufficient, that we declare, That by none of these Expressions we mean any *causeless Separation*, but only such Acts as were necessarily consequential to the imposing your Errors and Corruptions as Conditions of Communion with your Church. To the latter Part

P. 135.] N. 3.

his Lordship answers, *That the Protestants did not get that Name, by protesting against the Church of Rome, but by protesting (and that when nothing else would serve) against her Errors and Superstitions. Do you but remove them from the Church of Rome, and our Protestation is ended, and our Separation too.* This, you think, will be answered with our old put off, *That it is the common Pretext of all Hereticks, when they sever themselves from the Roman Catholick Church.* If your Church indeed were what she is not, the *Catholick Church*, we might be what we are not, *Hereticks*: But think it not enough to prove us *Hereticks*, that you call us so, unless you will likewise take it for granted, that the Pope is *Antichrist*, and your Church, *the Whore of Babylon*, because they are as often, and as confidently called so. And if your Church be truly so (as she is shrewdly suspected to be), Do you think she, and all her Followers, would not as confidently call such as dissented from her, *Hereticks*, and the using those Expressions of her, *virulent Execrations against her*, as you do now, supposing her not to be so? What therefore would belong to your Church, supposing her as bad as any Protestants imagine her to be, cannot certainly help to persuade us, That she is not so bad as she is. When you say still, *That Protestants did really depart from the Roman Church, and in so doing, remained separate from the whole Church*, you very fairly beg the Thing in dispute, and think us uncivil for denying it. You know not what that Passage means, *That the Protestants did not voluntarily depart, taking their whole Body and Cause together*; since there is no Obscurity in the Expression, but a Defect elsewhere. I can only say, That his Lordship was not bound to find you an Understanding as oft as you want it. But it were an easie Matter to help you; for it is plain, that he speaks those Words to distinguish the common Cause of Protestants, from the Heats and Irregularities of some particular Persons, whom he did not intend to justify, such as he saith, *Were either peevish, or ignorantly Zealous.*

And

And if you distinguish the Sense of your Church from the Judgments of particular Persons, I hope it may be as lawful for us to distinguish the body and cause of Protestants from the inconsiderate Actings of any particular Men. All that which follows about the name of Protestants, which his Lordship saith, Took its rise, not from protesting simply against the Roman Church, but against the Edict at Worms, which was for the restoring all things to their former state, without any Reformation, is so plain and evident, that nothing but a mind to cavil, and to give us the same things over and over, could have made you stay longer upon it. For what else means your talk of Innovation in Matters of Religion (which we say, was caused by you) and protesting against the Roman Church, and consequently against all particular Visible Churches in the World, and that which none but Hereticks and Schismatics used to do? Do you think these Passages are so hard, that we cannot know what they mean, unless we have them so often over? But they are not so hard to be understood, as to be believed, and that the rather, because we see you had rather say them often, than prove them once. If the Popes professed Reformation necessary as to many Abuses, I hope they are not all Schismatics who call for the redress of Abuses in your Church. But, if all the Reformation we are to expect of them, be that, which you say, was effectually ordained by the Council of Trent, if there had not been an Edict at Worms, there were the Decrees of that Council which would have made a Protestation necessary. Although we think your Church needs Reformation in Manners and Discipline, as much as any in the World, yet those are not the Abuses mainly insisted on by the Protestants, as the Grounds of their Separation, and therefore his Lordship ought to be understood, of a Reformation as to the Errors and Corruptions of the Roman Church; and doubtless that Edict of Worms which was for the restoring all things to their former state, did cut off all hopes of any such Reformation as was necessary for the Protestants to return to the Roman Communion. And whatever you say, till you have proved the contrary better than as yet it is done, it will appear, that they are the Protestants who stand for the ancient and undefiled Doctrine of the Catholick Church, against the novel and corrupt Tenets of the Roman Church. And such kind of Protestation no true Christian, who measures his being Catholick, by better Grounds than Communion with the Church of Rome, will ever have cause to be ashamed of.

P. 147.

But A. C. (saith his Lordship) goes on, and will needs have it, that the Protestants were the cause of the Schism. For, (saith the) though the Church of Rome did thrust them from her by Excommunication, yet they had first divided themselves by obstinate holding and teaching Opinions contrary to the Roman Faith, and practice of the Church, which to do, S. Bernard thinks, is pride, S. Austin, madness. At this his Lordship takes many and just Exceptions, 1. That holding and teaching was not the prime cause neither, but the Corruptions and Superstitions of Rome, which forced many men to hold and teach the contrary. So the prime Cause was there still. Now to this your Answer is very considerable. That the Bishop of Rome being S. Peter's Successor in the Government of the Church, and Infallible (at least with a General Council) it is impossible, that Protestants or other Sectaries, should ever find such Errors or Corruptions definitively taught by him, or received by the Church, as should either warrant them to preach against her Doctrine, or lawfully to forsake her Communion. We say, Your Church hath erred; you say, It is impossible she should; we offer you evident Proofs of her Errors; you say, She is Infallible; we say, It is impossible, that Church should be Infallible, which we can make appear hath been deceived; you tell us again, It is

p. 11.

P. 136. n. 4.

Ibid.

impossible *she should be deceived*; for, let *Hereticks* say what they will, *she is Infallible*. And if this be not a Satisfactory Way of answering, let the World judge. But having already pulled down that *Babel of Infallibility*, this Answer falls to the Ground with it; and to use your Phrase, *The truth is*, all that you have in effect to say for your Church, is, that she is *Infallible*, and the *Catholick Church*, and by this means you think to cast the *Schism* upon us; and these Things are great enough indeed, if you could but make any shew of Proof for them; but not being able to do that, you do in effect as much, as if a Man in a *high Fever* should go about to demonstrate it was impossible for him to be *sick*, which, the more he takes pains to do, the more evident his Distemper is to all who hear him. And it is shrewdly to be suspected, if your Errors had not been great and palpable, you would have contented your selves with something short of *Infallibility*. But as the Case is with your Church, I must confess it is your greatest Wildom to talk most of *Infallibility*; for if you can but meet with any weak enough to swallow that, all other things go down without dispute; but if men are left at Liberty to examine Particulars, they would as soon believe it was impossible for that man to *fall*, whom they see upon the ground, as your Church to be *infallible*, which they find overspread with Error and Corruptions.

Ibid.

Much such another Answer you return to his Lordships second Exception, which is, at his calling the *Christian Faith* the *Roman Faith*: For, you say, *It is no incongruity so to call it, for the Bishop of Rome being Head of the whole Christian or Catholick Church, the Faith approved and taught by him as Head thereof, though it be de facto, the general Faith and Profession of all Christians, may yet very well be called the Roman Faith; Why? because the Root, Origin, and chief Foundation under Christ, of its being practised and believed by Christians, is at Rome*. But if the *Bishop of Rome* be no such thing as *Head of the Christian Church* (and they must have a very wide Faith, which must swallow that *Universal Headship*, with all the *Appurtenances*, upon your bare Affirmation) if it belongs no more to him to approve and teach the Faith than to any other *Catholick Bishop*, if the coming from *Rome* affords no Credibility at all to the *Christian Faith*; then still there remains as great an incongruity as may be in calling the *Christian Faith* the *Roman Faith*. And as to all these my denial is as good as your Affirmation; when you undertake to prove, I shall to answer.

P. 148.

If *A. C.* adds the *practice of the Church to the Roman Faith*, I see no Advantage is gotten by it, for the first must limit the latter, and the Faith being *Roman*, the Church must be so too, and therefore all your Cavils on that Subject come to nothing.

§. 12.
P. 137.

The third Exception is, against the Places out of *S. Bernard*, and *S. Austin*, which, his Lordship saith, are mis applied; for neither of them (saith he) *spake of the Roman*; and *S. Bernard* perhaps neither of the *Catholick*, nor the *Roman*, but of a particular Church or Congregation. His Words are, *What greater Pride, than that one Man should prefer his judgment before the whole Congregation? Which A. C. conveniently to his Purpose rendred before*

Quæ major superbia quam ut unus homo toti Congregationi iudicium suum præferat, tanquam ipse solus Spiritum Dei habeat?
S. Bern. Serm. 3. de Resurrect.

Ibid.

the whole Congregation of all the Christian Churches in the World. Whereas no such thing is in him as all the Christian Churches in the World. And his Lordship saith, *He thinks it is plain, that he speaks both of, and to the particular Congregation, to which he was then preaching*. This you deny not, but say, *The Argument holds à minori ad majus, to shew the more exorbitant Pride of those, who prefer their private fanatick*

natick Opinions, before the Judgment of the whole Catholick Church. The Roman Church you should have said, for you own no Catholick Church, but what is Roman, and therein the Argument you mention will hold yet further, against those who prefer the Novel Opinions of the Roman Church, before the ancient Apostolical Faith of the truly Catholick Church. His Lordship adds, That it is one thing to prefer a Man's private Judgment before the whole Congregation; and another, for an intelligent Man in something unsatisfied, modestly to propose his Doubts even to the Catholick Church. And much more may a whole National Church, nay, the whole Body of Protestants do it. Now you very wisely leave out this last Clause, that you might take an Opportunity to declaim against Luther, Zuinglius, Calvin, &c. for want of Modesty. But what Pretext could there have been for such Virulency, had they been guilty of what you charge them, if you would but have given us all that his Lordship said? And may not I now therefore more justly return you your own Language in the same Page, upon a far less Occasion? That here's a manifest Robbery of part of his Lordship's Words, for which you are bound to Restitution. For his Lordship, as it were, foreseeing this Cavil, warily adds that concerning a whole National Church, and the whole Body of Protestants; which you for Reasons best known to your self, craftily leave out. But we must excuse our Adversary for this slip, though it be an unhand-some one; For the truth is, he had no other way to hide the guiltiness of his own Pen, &c. These are your own Words only applied, and that much more justly, to your self, for a more palpable Fault in the very same Page, wherein you had accused his Lordship for one of that kind. But you go on further, and supposing the Doubts had been modestly proposed, yet this could not at all help the Protestant Cause, in regard their Doubts were in Points of Faith, already determined for such by Authority of the Catholick Church; to question any of which with what seeming Modesty soever is sinful, heretical, and damnable. Were it our present Business, it were easie to make it appear, that the far greatest part of the Matters in Controversie, were never determined as Points of Faith, before the Council of Trent, and, I hope you will not say, that was before the Reformation, or any Proposal of Doubts? But, if they had been defined by your Church for Matters of Faith, and our great Doubt be, How your Church comes to have this Power of determining Points of Faith, to whom should this Doubt be propounded? to your Church, no doubt then we should hear from her, as now we do from you, That to question it with what seeming Modesty soever, is sinful, heretical, and damnable. And, Is it not then likely that your Church should ever yield to the Proposal of Doubts? And you do well to tell us so; for it will save Protestants a great deal of Labour, when they see your Church so incurable, that she makes it sinful, heretical, and damnable, to question any thing she hath determined. Although we do with much more Reason assert it to be sinful, heretical and damnable in your Church, to offer to obtrude erroneous Doctrines on the Faith of the Christian World, as Points necessary to be believed, and to urge superstitious Practices as the Conditions of Communion with her.

To the place of S. Austin, wherein he saith, *That it is a part of most insolent Madness, for any Man to dispute, Whether that be to be done, which is usually done in and through the whole Catholick Church of Christ.* His Lordship answers, 1. *Here's not a Word of the Roman Church, but of that which is all over the World, Catholick, which Rome never yet was; and for all your boast of having often shewed, That the Roman and the Catholick are all one; I dare leave it to the indifferent Reader, Whether you have not*

Ibid.

p. 150, 151.

miserably failed in your attempts that way. 2. He answers, *That A. C. applies this to the Roman Faith, whereas S. Austin speaks expressly of the Rites and Ceremonies of the Church, and particularly about the manner of offering upon Maundy-Thursdai, whether it be in the Morning, or after Supper, or both.* 3. *'Tis manifest by the Words themselves, that S. Austin speaks of no matter of Faith there, Roman, nor Catholick, for he speaks of things done, and to be done, and not for things believed, or to be believed.* 4. *A right sober Man may, without the least touch of Insolency or Madness, dispute a business of Religion with the Roman, either Church or Prelate, as all Men know Irenæus did with Victor.* Now to all this you reply, *That the Argument still holds à minori ad majus, and reaches to every Person that in any matter whatsoever obstinately opposes himself against the Church of God.* And is not this an excellent way of arguing from the less to the greater, to argue from a Rite or Ceremony observed by the Universal Church to a matter of Faith determined by the Roman Church? This is à minori ad majus with a witness. But your Reason is as good as your Answer, which is, *because there was always some point or matter of Faith involved in every Universally practised Rite or Ceremony of the Church.* I pray Sirthen, Tell us what the matter of Faith was which lay in the Offering on Maundy-Thursdai in the Morning, or after Supper? and by whom this point of Faith was determined? and how far it is obligatory? and whether it be not sinful, heretical, and damnable, so much as modestly to doubt of it? For all this, you told us, belongs to all matters of Faith determined by the Catholick Church. What remains of this Chapter, need not hold us long, for A. C.'s illation from the Catholick Churches not erring, that therefore it cannot be lawful to separate from the Roman Church, is absurd and illogical; and depends on that gross mistake, that the Roman and Catholick Church are all one, which we have abundantly disproved in the precedent Chapter. What follows concerning the Catholick Churches not erring, and how far that extends, concerning the Catalogue of Fundamentals, and any Errors admitted in the Church, being destructive to its Being, because derogatory to God's Veracity, have been so amply discussed in their proper places, that I find no Temptation from any new Arguments here suggested, to resume the debate of them. There being then nothing material, which hath not been handled already; I here conclude this Chapter.

C H A P. III.

110: 2: D Of keeping Faith with Hereticks.

The Occasion of this Dispute. The Reason why this Doctrine is not commonly defended: Let all own such Principles from whence it necessarily follows. The matter of Fact as to the Council of Constance, and John Husse opened. Of the nature of the Safe-conduct granted him by the Emperor, that it was not a general one, salvâ justitiâ, but particular, jure speciali; which is largely proved. The Particulars concerning Hierom of Prague. Of the Safe-conduct granted by the Council of Trent. Of the Distinction of Secular and Ecclesiastical Power, and that from thence it follows, that Faith is not to be kept with Hereticks. Simancha, and several others fully assert this Doctrine. Of the Invitation to the Council of Trent, and the good Instructions there; and of Publick Disputation.

A.C.'s Endeavour not only to charge Protestants with the guilt of Schism, but to justifie and clear the Proceedings of the Church of Rome towards them, hath led us into a new Dispute, how far she is to be trusted in the greatest Promises which are made to such whom she accounts Hereticks. Which is occasioned by these Words of his, *That after this Breach was made, the Church of Rome was so kind and careful to seek the Protestants, that she invited them publickly with Safe-conduct to Rome, to a General Council, freely to speak what they could for themselves: Or, if we take his Words, as you give them us, the Sense is the same to our Purpose (and therefore you impertinently cavil with his Lordship for not keeping Faith with A.C.) Which did at first seek to recal them from their Novel Opinions, and after their Breach did permit, yea invite them publickly to Rome to a General Council, &c.* Upon which his Lordship says: *Indeed I think the Church of Rome did carefully seek the Protestants; but I doubt it was to bring them within their Net. And she invited them to Rome. A very safe Place, if you mark it, for them to come to, just as the Lion (in the Apologue) invited the Fox to his own Den. Yea, but there was Safe conduct offered too: Yes, Conduct perhaps, but not safe, or safe perhaps, for going thither, but none for coming thence. Vestigia nulla retrorsum. Yea, but it should have been to a General Council. Perhaps so. But was the Conduct safe, that was given to a Council which they call General, to some others before them? No sure, John Husse, and Hierom of Prague burnt for all their Safe-conduct. And so long as the Jesuits write and maintain, That Faith given is not to be kept with Hereticks, and the Church of Rome leaves this lewd Doctrine uncensured (as it hath hitherto done, and no Exception put in of Force and Violence) A.C. shall pardon us, that we come not to Rome, nor within the reach of Roman Power, what freedom of Speech soever he promised us. For to what end freedom of Speech on their part, since they are resolved to alter nothing? And to what end freedom of Speech on our part, if after Speech hath been free, Life shall not? This you call a Theme, which, for the most part, our Adversaries love to dwell upon, as thinking they have some great Advantage against us therein. And, can you blame them for insisting much on that which their Lives are concerned in, and it will appear in the Prosecution of this Subject, that we have this great Advantage against you, that we are come to understand your Arts so well, as not so easily to be caught by your perfidious Subtilties. And as we understand your Practices better*

p. 1.

P. 143. n. 7.

P. 152.

ter than to rely on your Promises of this Nature, so we are not so ignorant of the Intrigues of your Proceedings, as to suppose that commonly and openly you should defend this Position, That *Faith is not to be kept with Hereticks*. For thereby you would lose the intent and design of it; for none would be so silly as to venture themselves into the Hands of such, who openly profess, *They are not bound to keep Faith with them*. For, Do you think that Father *Fulgentio* would ever have gone to *Rome* on the Safe-conduct most solemnly given by *Paul* 5. if he had understood beforehand, with what Perfidiousness he should have been dealt with there; and all under this Pretext, that *Safe-conduct* was given for his coming thither, but not for his going thence? Is this the *Faith* of the *Apostolical See*? Is this the *Catholick and Roman Faith*? If so, the *Roman Faith*, before ever it was *Christian*, was much more infallible than this; that never was acquainted with such a perfidious Infallibility. Well then might his Lordship say, *The Conduct might be safe for his going thither, but not for his coming thence*. *Vestigia nulla retrorsum*. And so *Fulgentio* to his Sorrow found it. We see therefore, it is very necessary for you to disown this Principle, as much as possible, till you have occasion to practise it, and then Woe be to them to whose Lot it falls to make the Experiment. Though therefore both *publickly and privately, in Word and Writing*, as you tell us, *You teach and profess, That Faith is to be kept as well with Hereticks, as Catholicks*, yet your Adversaries have no great Reason to rely on your Promises, when they find your Practices apparently to the contrary, and those Practices built on such Principles which you all own, and contend for, and that notwithstanding what you confidently say to the contrary, several of your Writers have in Terms asserted it. All which shall be made good in this Chapter. And therefore, though you say it, and say it over again, those who know the Ambiguity of your Expressions, your many Reservations, and Exceptions which you make, will not be very confident of the honesty of your Meaning, by the fairness of your Expressions. These are therefore *no Clamorous Accusations*, but very sad Truths, which the Experience of the World, and your Dealings have too often taught us; that at last we are forced to distinguish between a *Princes Safe-conduct*, and an *Ecclesiastical Trepan*. For no other will that appear to be, which was granted by Pope *Paul* to *Fulgentio*, or the Emperor, and Council of *Constance* to *John Husse*, and *Hierom* of *Prague*. If Christ therefore, after he had said, *That they should give to Cæsar the Things that are Cæsars*, had either denied the Payment of Tribute, or demanded it himself, *Becanus* might then say, That was a fit Parallel for you in this Controversie, whose open Actions do palpably contradict you, when you say, *That Faith is to be kept with Hereticks*.

¶ 2.

For the clearing of which, we must first relate the Matter of Fact in the Case of the Council of *Constance*, and then examine the several Evasions you make in Vindication of their Proceedings, notwithstanding the Safe-conduct given by the Emperor and Council. The Story then is briefly this; A Council at *Constance* being called, for redressing Abuses in the Church; and putting an end to that *Schism*, which was between the three Antipopes, *Gregory* 12, *Benedict* 13, *John* 23. *John Husse* is summoned by the Emperor *Sigismund* to appear before it. And to take away all Fears and Suspicions of unhandsome Dealing, the Emperor grants him a Safe-conduct, in which it was expressed, *Omni prorsus impedimento remoto, transire, stare, morari, & redire libere permittatis*; that without all manner of Hindrance, he should be suffered to come, appear, stay, and return freely. That such a Safe-conduct was given by the Emperor, and pleaded by *Husse*, is agreed

agreed on all Sides. But notwithstanding this, he had not been above three Weeks in *Constance*, but, contrary to his Safe-conduct, he is thrown into Prison; which being done in the Emperor's Absence, he returns to the Council, and argues the Case with them, upon which they pass the Decree contained in the 19th Session of that Council, in these Words cited in the Margin, which that you may not quarrel with my Interpretation of, I will take your own: *This present sacred Synod declareth, That by whatsoever Safe-conduct, granted by the Emperor, Kings, or other secular Princes, to Hereticks, or such as are defamed for Heresie, no Prejudice can arise, no Impediment can, or ought to be put to the Catholic Faith, or other Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction, but that (notwithstanding the said Safe-conduct) it may be lawful for any competent and ecclesiastical Judge to enquire into the Errors of such Persons, and duly otherwise proceed against them, and punish them so far as Justice shall require, if they shall pertinaciously refuse to revoke their Errors; yea, tho' they come to the Place of Judgment, relying upon such Safe-conduct, and would not otherwise come thither; nor doth he who so promiseth, remain obliged in any thing, having done what lies in him.* Upon this Decree of the Council, the Emperor looks on himself, as absolved from his Obligation, and not only concurred in the Sentence against *Husse*, but gave order himself about his Execution. The Question then is, Whether the Emperor did not break his Faith with *John Husse* in so doing; and, Whether the Council did not decree, that neither he, nor any else, were bound to keep it with Hereticks. Although this Case be so plain and clear to all Persons, who have any Sense of Justice and Honesty, that we dare appeal to the most indifferent Persons in the World, Whether it be not a notorious Violation of Faith, after a most solemn Promise of safe Return, to proceed to Judgment against the Person, who came merely relying on that Promise; and the same Person to be the Instrument of his Execution, who gave the Safe-conduct on which he trusted: And whether the declaring, that such a Person is not obliged to keep his Promise, because it is a Matter of Heresie he had promised in, be not to declare, *That no Faith is to be kept with Hereticks.* Yet since no Actions are so bad, if they tend to your Advantage, but you will have something to blind the Eyes of the Simple with, we must consider what you have to plead in Vindication of these Proceedings. You tell us then, *That the Emperor did not break his Faith with* P. 153. N. 2.

John Husse, and that notwithstanding the Safe-conduct given, he was justly burnt. Bold and daring Assertions! but we must enquire into the Reasons of them. Two Things you seem most to rely on, and the Strength of all your Answer depends on them; which being the Things, *Becanus*, and the rest of your Party insist on in this Case, I shall more closely examine. The first is, *From the Nature of the Safe-conduct given, that it was not such as could hinder Justice*; the second is, *From the Difference of the secular and ecclesiastical Power, and that the Emperor could make no Promise in Prejudice of the Churches Jurisdiction.*

First, You distinguish of a Safe-conduct, which, you say, may be granted Q. 3.
two Ways; first, *Jure communi*, when 'tis given only against unjust Violence, *salva semper Justitiâ*, provided always that Justice be not impeached: Secondly, *Jure speciali*, when it secures a Man against all Violence whatsoever, whether just or unjust, and chiefly in that Cause for which it was given. In the former Ibid.

Præsens sancta Synodus ex quovis Salvo-conductu per Imperatorem, Reges, & alios sæculi Principes, Hereticis vel de Heresi diffamatis, putantes eosdem sic à suis Erroribus revocare, quocunque se vinculo obstrinxerint, concessio, nullum Fidei Catholica vel Jurisdictioni Ecclesiasticæ Præjudicium generari, vel Impedimentum præstari posse, seu debere declarat, quo minus dicto Salvo-conductu non obstante, liceat judici competenti & ecclesiastico, de hujusmodi Personarum Erroribus inquirere, & alias contra eos debite procedere, eosdemque punire, quantum Justitia suadebit, si suos Errores revocare pertinaciter recusaverint; etiamsi de Salvo-conductu confisi ad Locum venerint Judicii alias non venturi; nec sic promittentem, cum fecerit quod in ipso est, ex aliquo remansisse obligatum. Concil. Constant. Sess. 19. P. 1075. Tom. 7. Concil. P. 2. Ed. Binii.

former Manner only, you say, a Safe conduct was granted by the Emperor to John Husse, and by the Council of Constance to Hierom of Prague: In the latter Sort, the Council of Trent offered Safe-conduct to the Protestants in Germany, &c. No Faith therefore was broken with John Husse; for, a Safe-conduct was only given him *Jure communi*, by which Justice was to remain un-impeachable, since he was only promised to be defended against unjust Violence; which was performed. I grant, a Safe-conduct may be given two Ways; the first is to secure Men from all unjust Violence, in order to a legal Tryal; and this is granted in such Cases, when the Person accused looks on the Law as open for him as well as his Adversaries, and puts himself on a fair Tryal before equal and indifferent Judges: And in such Cases the Intent of the Safe-conduct is expressed, *Damus tibi Fidem publicam Causam dicendi in Judicio contra Vim, non contra Juris executionem*; as the Formula of it is in the Roman Empire; thence that Imperial Constitution which prohibits that any Safe-conduct be given to the Accuser, or the guilty Person, *adversus publicum Judicium, sed solum contra Vim*, against publick Justice, but only against Violence: But then these are the Safe-conducts which subordinate Officers can only grant; because these have no Power over the Life of Persons, but they are only to see Justice duly administred to all Persons, in order to which they may give such Safe-conducts as may prevent such Things as may hinder the due Execution of Justice. But then further, a Safe-conduct may be given with respect to those who are to judge of the Cause, *i. e.* in case a Person avoids Appearance, upon Fears that the Persons he is summoned before, will presently cast him into Prison, or put him to Death; now, if a Safe-conduct be granted by him, who hath the absolute Power of Life and Liberty, so as to hinder the Execution of any Sentence passed, in this Case the Safe-conduct is full and absolute, and admits of no Restrictions or Limitations. Now this latter is plainly our present Case; For John Husse had been summoned before to appear at Rome, to vindicate himself in Point of *Herese*, but suspecting foul Dealing, he durst not go: And, Can we in Reason think he would ever have gone to Constance, if the Emperor had not granted him such a Conduct as might secure him from his Fears, as to his Life and Liberty? And therefore, since the Emperor, to whom it only belonged to dispose of both, had granted him so express a Safe-conduct, he thought he might securely go. For, To what End or Purpose is a Safe-conduct granted, if it be not to secure that which the Person to whom it was given, had most Cause to fear? Now it is apparent, John Husse was not afraid of any unjust Violence by the Way, for he was so secure as to that, that he left his Safe-conduct in the Hands of his Friends, till he came at Constance, as appears by the unquestionable Reports of that Story on all Hands; which is an evident Argument, that the Intent of the Safe-conduct was to secure him at Constance, from any Injury being done him by the Council. And although the Council might take upon them, not only to judge of *Herese*, but to condemn him for it; yet as long as the Execution of that Sentence belonged to the secular Power, he had Reason to think, that whatever the Council might determine, yet the Emperor's Faith being solemnly given him, he need not fear the Execution of it. For that being in the Emperor's Power, he was bound by his publick Faith not to give way to it. To make this clear by an Instance; It is more evident by our Laws, that one who hath taken Orders at Rome, coming into the Nation, and being convicted of it, is liable to Death, than it was by the Laws then in Force, that such who were condemned for *Herese*, should be burnt; Suppose now, That a Priest be summoned by the King to appear before his Courts of Justice,

with

with a Safe-conduct, or Promise given, that he should come, appear, and return freely, without any Hindrance; Would not you, or any other *Romish Priest*, think your selves hardly dealt with, and that the King had broken his Faith, if he should not only suffer you to be Condemned, but give express Order for your Execution; and then tell you, that the Safe-conduct was to be understood *Salva Justitia*, without any Impeachment of Justice, and that it was only to protect you from all unjust Violence? And, Was not the Case just the same here of the Emperor *Sigismund*, and *John Huss*? Was *John Huss* so ignorant, as not to know they would condemn him for Heretic, when a Council at *Rome*, had condemned him for it already? Or, Did not he know what Course was like to be taken with Persons so condemned? What could he then imagine to be the Intent of this Safe-conduct, but to secure him from all Violence to be done to his Person, under a Pretence of Execution of Justice? And for all this, was not the Emperor's Faith violated, when he was not only imprisoned, but burnt, by the Emperor's express Order, notwithstanding his solemn Promise, that he should come, appear, and return freely, without any Hindrance? If this be a Safe-conduct, it is only such a one as they that go to the Gallows have, a Safe-conduct to Execution. Besides, that this could not be such a Safe conduct, *Salva Justitia*, as you speak of, is manifest from the Tenour and Words of it. For Safe-conducts, being granted in Favour of Persons, are to be taken in their largest Sense, if no Limitations be expressed in them; and it is a Rule among those who should, and do understand these Things best, *That a Safe-conduct is of the Nature of a Covenant, and the Words of it import a Promise, and therefore, if they be general, are extended as far as the Words will bear. And that all the Doctors do unanimously concur, that a general Safe-conduct of coming to a Judge, or appearing in a Court of Judicature, do import a freedom of Departure, and going thence.* So that we see, if we take the Emperor's Safe-Conduct in the express Words of it, it imports much more than such a one as is only *Salva Justitia*; because it ran in the most general and comprehensive Terms, and was granted not by any subordinate Judge, but by the Emperor himself, who was able, as well as bound, to make it good in the most large and extensive Sense. But further, if this had been granted only *Salva Justitia*, so that the Council had Liberty to proceed on him as they saw good, What made the Emperor take their Imprisonment of him so ill, as *Nauclerus* and others report he did, and that because of the Safe-conduct he had given him? It seems the Emperor wanted *Becanus*, and you, to have told him, That he never granted any Safe-conduct, but what had the Reservation of a *Salva Justitia*, and that such Justice too, as his greatest Enemy must shew him: If he had known this, he needed not have been troubled at that which he made account of, in granting the Safe-conduct. Lastly, What need the Council have taken such Pains to satisfy the Emperor, by declaring in a Decree, that neither he, nor any Prince was bound by their Safe-conducts, to hinder Hereticks from being punished, if he had not thought himself obliged to do it, by the Safe-conduct he had given? And if he did think so before the Decree of the Council, then certainly there was no *Salva Justitia* understood by him in the Safe-conduct he had granted. Thus we see, how on all Hands it appears, from *Huss*'s Fears and Desires, the Emperor's Power, the Nature of Safe-Conducts, the Emperor's own Sense of it, and the Council's Decree, That this first Answer hath no ground at all, *viz.* that the Safe-conduct was grant-

Verba Salvo-conductus sunt Verba fidei data, & sapient Naturam pacti: quare, si generalia sint, extenduntur quatenus verba patiuntur. Omnes Doctores uno ore asserunt, Generalem promissionem Securitatis veniendi ad Judicem seu comparandi in Judicio, etiam Libertatem recedendi abeundi; complecti. Pet. Pre-mus de Securit. Quest. 6. p. 33, 36.

ed *jure communi*, and that it was only to hinder unjust Violence, and not the execution of Justice.

But besides, you say, *John Huss* was justly burnt, for two reasons: *The first is, For being obstinate in his Heresie; the second, For having fled, which the Emperor had prohibited in his safe-conduct, under pain of Death.* I answer, It is not, Whether a Man, obstinate in Heresie, may be burnt, which is now the Question, although that may justly bear a Dispute too: But, Whether one, suspected for Heresie, and coming to a Council with safe-conduct for coming and returning, may be burnt without Violation of Faith; your first reason then, is nothing to the Purpose, and your second as little: First, Because there is no certain Evidence at all of *Huss's* flying; it not being objected against him by the Emperor, who only upbraided him with his Obstinacy in his Heresie, as the cause of his Execution; and withal, if *Huss* had fled, and had suffered Death for that, as you say he ought to have done, he would not have suffered the Death proper to Heresie, but to flying; nor been accounted (as by all your own Authors he is) a sufferer on the account of Heresie. But this being a groundless Calumny, it needs no further Confutation.

§. 4.

But before we come to your second Answer, the case of *Hierom* of Prague must be discussed so far as it is distinct from that of *John Huss*; who, it seems, was trepanned by a pretended Safe-conduct granted him by the Council, and not by the Emperor, wherein, you tell us, *that express Clause of salva semper justitia was inserted* (which is another Argument that the Safe-conduct of the Emperor to *Huss* was of another Nature, because it ran in general Terms, without any such Clause) but poor *Hierom*, who, it seems, was not acquainted with the Arts and Subtilties of his Enemies, but thought them as honest as himself, ventures to *Constance* upon this Safe-conduct: but when he came thither, and began to understand the Jugglings of his Enemies, he thought to shift for himself by Flight, but being taken, was burnt. So that *Hierom* suffered through his honest Simplicity and Credulity, not considering what that *salva justitia* would mean in his Case, which, as they interpreted it, was such another Safe-conduct, as known Malefactors have to the place of Justice: but to call it a Safe-conduct, in the Sense which *Hierom* apprehended it in, is as proper as to say, A Man that is to be executed shall have a *Salvo* for his Life. This was therefore intended, as appears by the Event, as a meer Trick to bring him within their Power; and so all such Safe-conducts granted with those Clauses (by such Persons who are to interpret them themselves) are, and nothing else: For they are the sole Judges what this Justice shall be. Neither can you say then, That Faith was kept with *Hierom* of Prague: for no such thing as a Safe-conduct, truly so called, was intended him; and when the Emperor was solicited to grant him one, he utterly denied it, because of the bad Success he had in that of *John Huss*; and some of the Council being then present with the Emperor, offered to give him a Safe-conduct, but they very honestly explained themselves, that it was a Safe-conduct for coming thither, but not for going thence again. And so it proved. So that Faith was well given to *Hierom* of Prague, and as well kept to *John Huss*.

But, say you, *Had the Protestants gone to the Council of Trent, upon the safe-conduct granted them by that Council jure speciali, in the second manner, they could not at all have been punished under any pretence of Heresie, without manifest breach of Faith; which all Catholicks hold to be unlawful. The like may be said of the Safe-conduct offered them for going to Rome.* But you must better satisfy us, that you look upon this as a breach of Faith, than as yet

yet you have done. For so many are your Ambiguities, in your Expressions of this Nature, that Men who know your Arts, can hardly tell when they have your right Meaning. For you may look on all Breach of Faith as unlawful, and yet not look on your acting contrary to your express Words, in Safe-conducts offered to Hereticks, to be a Breach of Faith. For you may say, Faith is there only broken, where Men are bound to keep it; but you are not bound to keep it with Hereticks, and that because your Obligation to the Church is greater than it can be to Hereticks: when therefore you have Hereticks in your Power, it is an easie Matter for you to say, that, were it in any thing else, but in a Matter so nearly concerning the Interest of your *Holy Mother the Church*, you could not but observe it, but your Obligation to that is so great, as destroys all other which are contrary to it; and the Obligation being destroyed, there is no Breach of Faith at all; and therefore you may hold all Breach of Faith unlawful, and yet you may proceed against those whom you account Hereticks, contrary to all Engagements whatsoever, and then say, This is no Breach of Faith. And the Truth is, by your Doctrines of Equivocations, and mental Reservations, you have made all manner of converse in the World so lubricous and uncertain, that he who hath to deal with you, especially in Matters where the Interest of your Church is concerned, had need be wary, and remember to distrust, or else he may repent it afterwards. If you therefore account the Protestants crafty Foxes, in not coming to Rome, or the Council of Trent, it was, because they would not venture too near the *Lion's Den*; but if you will not account them wise Men, for refusing so fair an Offer, you will give us leave to think them so, till they see better Reason to trust your Offers. And the Council of Trent did very well to tell them in their Form of Safe-conduct, they would not do by them as the Council of Constance did, for therein they shew, how much the Faith of Councils was sunk by that, so that if that were not particularly excepted, no trust would ever be given to them more. But, supposing the Safe-conduct of the Council of Trent to have been never so free from Suspicion, the Protestants had sufficient Reasons not to appear there, as will be manifested afterwards.

We come therefore now to your second Answer, in Vindication of the Council of Constance, which is this, *That by that Decree the Council declares, that no Secular Power, how sovereign soever, can hinder the Proceedings of the Ecclesiastical Tribunal in Causes of Heresie; for which there is great Reason; and consequently, if the Emperor, or any other Secular Prince, grants a Safe-conduct, or makes Promise of any thing to the Prejudice of that Jurisdiction, it shall not hold. The Reason is, because 'tis a Promise made of a thing not pertaining to the Jurisdiction of that Prince, nor wholly in his Power to see performed.* To this I answer, 1. That if I understand any thing, this is expressly to say, That no Prince is to keep Faith with Hereticks, and that is it which you are charged with; and you made use of this Distinction to free your selves from. Now that this is the plain meaning of it, thus appears; you say in the Words immediately after; *But the Council no where teaches, That Faith or Safe-conduct given in temporal Causes properly pertaining to the Princes Jurisdiction, is not to be kept by all, and to all Persons of what Condition soever, so far as it is possible.* Which is as much as to say, That in any other Case but that of Heresie, they are to keep Faith, but not in that: for this of Heresie, is that which you oppose to all Temporal Causes, and challenge it as belonging to an Ecclesiastical Tribunal; when therefore the Council of Constance decrees, That no Secular Power is obliged by any Safe-conduct, to any thing which may hinder the Ecclesiastical Tribunals proceeding in causes of Heresie, what doth it else but

declare in exprefs Terms, That *Faith is not to be kept with Hereticks, i. e.* in any thing relating to their Heresie; for this, you say, they have nothing to do with: and therefore let Kings and Princes make never so solemn Promises and Engagements to Men suspected of Heresie, to their Peril be it, who rely upon them, for they have nothing to do to promise in such Matters; and though their Faith be given never so publicly and solemnly, they are not bound to keep it; nay, they are bound not to keep it: for, if they should, it would be to the apparent Mischief and Prejudice of the Church. This necessarily follows from your own Words, and the Distinction here used by you. So that now we need seek no further than your self, and *Becanus*, for the open avowing of this Principle, That *no Prince is bound to keep Faith with Hereticks*; but if he doth promise Safe-conduct to them though it be more than he can do, yet the Church can make that good use of it, that by that Means she may get the Hereticks under her Power; and when she hath them, it is but then declaring this Promise to be null, and she may do with them as she pleases. Neither is it only *Becanus*, and you, who say this, but it is the received Principle among you, whatever you say or pretend to the contrary; I mean not, that you say in exprefs Terms, That *Faith is not to be kept with Hereticks*, but by this Distinction of the Secular and Ecclesiastical Power, as you use it, you say that from whence it necessarily follows. But yet I answer 2. Though this Distinction should be granted, yet it cannot really excuse the Emperor from violating his Faith. For, I say, he promised nothing but what was in his Power, which was, to secure him as to Life and Liberty. Now, although the Emperor had suffered the Ecclesiastical Tribunal, to do what belonged to it, which was to enquire into the Charge of Heresie, and to give Sentence upon the Person, yet the Execution belonged wholly to the Secular Power; as the Council it self acknowledged, when after the Sentence of Heresie was pronounced against *J. Husse*, there was nothing of the executive part which was pleaded, as belonging to the Church, but only Degradation, and that was performed in the Presence of

Hec Sancta Synodus Constantiensis Johannem Hus, attento quod Ecclesia Dei non habeat ultra quod gerere valeat, iudicio seculari relinquere, & ipsum curiae seculari relinquendum fore decernit. Concil. Constant. sess. 15. p. 1056.

the Council; upon which the *Sacred Synod declares*, That *they had no more to do with him, but to deliver him over to the Secular Power, and accordingly decrees it to be done.* Now when the Synod declares this, Is it not plain, that what concerns his Life, doth properly and only belong to the Secular Power? If therefore the Emperor was bound to do all which lay in him to do, he was effectually bound to secure him as to Life and Liberty, for both those lay within his Power. And therefore, when he gave Order for his Execution, he was highly guilty of the Violation of his Faith; and if the Council of *Constance* declared him absolved as to this too, it is yet more evident, that they not only decreed, That *no Faith was to be kept with Hereticks* in Matters concerning the Ecclesiastical Tribunal, but in such as concerned the Secular Power, which is as much as to say, Not at all. And by this the Vanity of this Distinction of the Secular and Ecclesiastical Power is sufficiently manifest, and that it evidently appears, that the Council of *Constance* did decree, That *no Faith was to be kept with Hereticks.* And thus I have proved, that his Lordship hath not, as you calumniate him, *ignorantly or maliciously wronged the Council*, but that no other tolerable Sense, besides that which his Lordship saith, can be made of the Decree then passed; and notwithstanding your Arts and Distinctions, nothing can be more plain, than that *John Husse* was trepanned into his Ruin by the Faith of the Emperor given to him. It can be therefore nothing but either palpable ignorance, or a Deceit as gross as trusting your Safe-conduct in a matter of Heresie, for you so confidently to assert, That

if

if the Relator had not mangled the Words of the Council (to deceive his Reader) but set down the decree fairly and fully as it is, the business had been so clear, that it would scarce have any dispute. Whereas his Lordship only sets down the title of the Decree, and so he tells you himself, and this he doth as faithfully as may be, and whereas nothing can more evidence the juggling of the Council, than the Decree itself doth, in which nothing is more plain than that, In case of Heresie, no Prince is bound to keep Faith with any Persons whatsoever.

From the Council of Constance, we proceed to other Authors, to see, whether they do not concur with it in this Opinion. For this, his Lordship cites

Simancha a Spanish Bishop, and a Canonist as well as Civilian, who expressly saith, That Faith is not to be kept with Hereticks, as neither with Tyrants, Pirates, or other public Robbers; and plainly justifies the Proceedings of the Council of Constance in that respect; in that Hereticks by their solemn Judgment were burnt, although public security had been given them. Let us now see, what answer

you return to these clear Citations. In general you say, *The Bishop was insincere or unadvised in quoting this Author.* I wonder wherem: I am sure, not so much as you are in your Answers to him. For, you say, *Simancha holds not this absolutely and universally, but only in cases wherein that which is promised cannot be lawfully performed.* Hence, say you, *Simancha hath these Words, Veruntamen (ut Marius Salomonius ait) promissa contra Christum fides, si præstetur, perfidia est, If Faith be given against Christ, that is, to the dishonour of God, or contrary to the Precepts of true Religion, it were perfidiousness to observe it.* But the Answer to this is easie: For it appears from *Simancha's* own Grounds, that he supposeth it holds universally, because Faith can never be given to Hereticks, so as that Promise can be lawfully performed, because thereby he supposeth it given against Christ, and to the dishonour of God, and therefore concludes, it would be Perfidiousness to observe it. And this is evident from *Simancha's* own Grounds, which he

gives for it. For, saith he, *if Faith be not to be kept with Tyrants, Pirates, and other Robbers, which kill the Body; much less with Hereticks who destroy Souls: which* reason being absolute and universal, his Proposition must be so too. And very consonantly to his former Assertions concludes, *That if Faith be given them with an Oath, against the publick good, against the Salvation of*

Souls, against divine and humane Laws, it is not to be kept; and it is well known that all Heresies are accounted so by you, and therefore in no Case Faith is to be kept with Hereticks. Neither can this possibly be understood meerly of private Persons; for his Words are general, and we see he vindicates the Proceedings of the Council at Constance upon these Grounds, and he

quotes *Marius Salomonius* and *Placa*, who likewise assert in terms, That Faith given to Hereticks is not to be kept, and makes use of the Instance of the Council of Constance to prove it. And *Menochius*, whom *Simancha* likewise cites, who was an Italian Canonist, and therefore might well know the Practices of Rome in these Cases, saith, That *Placa* expressly holds, That Faith is not to be kept with Hereticks, which, he saith, he understands so, when Faith is given to the Injury of the Catholick Faith: and cites *Conradus Brunus* to this purpose, That it is not lawful to make such Agreements with Here-

Fides Hæreticis data servanda non est, sicut nec Tyrannis, Piratis, & cæteris publicis prædonibus. Simancha Instit. Cathol. tit. 45. sect. 51.

Jure igitur Hæretici quidam gravissimo Concilii Constantiensis judicio, legitimâ flammâ concremati sunt, quamvis promissa illis securitas fuisset. Instit. tit. 46. sect. 52.

P. 155.

Si Tyrannis, Piratis, & cæteris prædonibus fides servanda non est, qui corpus occidunt; longe minus hæreticis pertinacibus, qui occidunt animas. Id. ib.

Quamobrem fides illis data, etiam juramento firmata, contra publicum bonum, contra salutem animarum, contra jura divina & humana, nullo modo servanda. Ib.

Scribit etiam Salomonius in d. l. 2. exact. de orig. juris, & refert Petrus Placa l. 1. epit. delict. c. 37. in fin. Ita observatum fuisse contra hæreticos vocatos in Concilio Constantiensi sub salvo-conductu, qui tamen contra datam fidem necati fuerunt. Non ergo salvo-conductui fidere debuit. D. Scipio. Menochius, lib. 1. Concil. 100. n. 191.

Quod verò scribit Placa d. c. 37. in fin. hæreticis datam fidem servandam non esse, intelligo cum data fides est ad detrimentum fidei Catholice. Id. Concil. 100. n. 219.

Ita enim loquitur Conradus Brunus in tract. de hæret. c. 14. l. 3. cum scribit, Non licere pacisci cum hæreticis, ut libere possint in damnata eorum sectâ vivere. n. 220.

ticks,

Quod si obijciatur, Concilium Constantiense non observasse Salvo-conductos concessos ab Imperatoribus & Regibus; facile erit respondere, Non licuisse illis Imperatoribus & Regibus, concedere tutos reddere hereticos; tum quia inferior non potest Salvo-conductum concedere dam-nato a majore, tum etiam quia Imperatorum & Regum est hereticos expugnare, non autem securos & tutos reddere; quemadmodum abunde tradit Conrad. Brunus, l. 3. de heret. c. 15. Restat a Concilio Salvi conductus illi annullati fuerunt. n. 227, 228.

ticks, that they may enjoy the Liberty of their own Sect. If therefore they must interpret, how far the Faith given tends to the Prejudice of the Catholick Faith, we see, how little Security can be had from any solemn Promise. And Menochius himself asserts the Safe conduct granted by Princes, in case of Heresie, to be unlawful, because the inferiour (as he supposes Princes to be to the Ecclesiastical Tribunal) cannot secure them who are condemned by the Superior, and because Kings and Emperors ought rather to destroy Hereticks, than to secure them. And therefore the Council of Constance did well in nulling the

Safe-conducts granted to Hereticks. And what now is this, but in plain Terms to assert, That Faith is not to be kept with Hereticks? Neither can you say, as some do, That they are the Canonists, and not the Church of Rome, which assert this: for, besides that the Canonists understand well enough the Intrigues and Proceedings of the Court of Rome, although it seems they do not conceal them so much as they should do, yet they are not only these who have asserted it, but some great Men of your Church have, upon Occasion, expressly said it; for we are not to expect that this should be avowed as a publick Opinion of your Church, for that were to make it unserviceable to you; but when you have those whom you call Hereticks at an Advantage, then is the time to discover this. So there wanted not some to perswade Charles the Fifth, notwithstanding the Safe-conduct given to Luther at his coming to Worms, to deal by him as the Council of Constance had done by John Huss, and that upon this very Account, That no Faith was to be kept with Hereticks: But the Emperor, and the Princes about him, were Persons of too great Honour and Honesty to hearken to such perfidious Counsels. And no meaner a Person than Cardinal Hosius,

Nunquam patiaris ullâ te ratione ad ea que promissisti præstanda teneri; quia Juramentum non debet esse vinculum iniquitatis. Hosius Cardinal. Epist. 193, 202, 220.

admonishes Henry, King of Poland, that he ought not to keep the Faith he had given to the Protestants, and gives this Reason for it, That an Oath ought not to be the Bond of Iniquity. And the Jesuit Possevin is reported to have given the same Counsel afterwards to Stephen King of Poland. But

these things are, as much as possible, kept from our view, and the Books containing such Doctrines in them, are like the Golden Legends bought up by themselves to prevent our Discovery of their Frauds and Imposture; and therefore, if we cannot instance in those Jesuits, who have expressly taught this Opinion in Print, yet that only argues the greater Fraud and Subtilty of them, who will own and practise such Things, which they dare not publicly avow to the World. And yet it appears from the way used by Becanus, and you, in Vindication of your selves, that you cannot possibly avoid the asserting such things, from whence it necessarily follows, That Faith is not to be kept with Hereticks. But because the Doctrine itself is grown a matter so odious to the World, being contrary to all Principles of Humanity and Justice, and which, if practised by all those who call each other Hereticks, would overthrow all civil Societies; therefore you dare not but in Terms disown it, though it still remains among those Arcana Societatis, those hidden Works of Darkness, which want only a fair Opportunity to discover themselves. But as much as you wipe your Mouth, though it be foul enough in saying, That neither the Bishop, nor all his Gang, are able to name one of them of that Opinion, to make it appear, how much you have abused your self in these Words; I shall make a short Business of it, and name your self for one, and Becanus your Author for another, and refer the Reader to what goes before,

for

for an Evidence that you own those Principles from whence it unavoidably follows, That no Faith is to be kept with Hereticks.

But, Are the Jesuits indeed grown such honest Men, that not one of their

Number can be named, who assert this Doctrine? A happy Change! For sure they were not always so; if we believe that excellent Person of as great Integrity as Learning, and a Romanist too, *Jac. Augustus Thuanus*, in his Elegy in *Parricidas*, wherewith he concludes his Sacred Poems, in which he speaks great and sad Truths of that honest Society, where he mentions those Cruelties and Assassinations, which were brought into these Parts of the World by the Arts and Opinions of a famous Society, which makes nothing of Laws, Faith, Honesty, Religion, to advance that Interest which it hath espoused; and expressly saith, That they deny Faith to be kept, that by their Distinctions and Subtilties, they enervate the Force of divine Commands, they deny Obedience to Authority, destroy Religion, under a Pretence of Piety, break Engagements, teach the murdering Kings; and what not? And yet all this while, not one

of all this Society ever taught, That Faith was not to be kept with Hereticks. But whence came then the great Disputes, Whether an Oath of Allegiance might be taken to Heretical Princes? Was it not from hence that Heresie was supposed to dissolve that Obligation to Obedience, which otherwise Men lay under? And if it doth destroy that Faith which Men owe to their Sovereigns, in case of Heresie; Will it not equally destroy that Faith which Princes promise to their Subjects in case of Heresie too? For what Reason can be given for the one, which will not hold for the other also. And who were they, I pray, but those Loyal Persons the Jesuits, who broached, fomented, and propagated that Doctrine? Was not Father *Creswell* a

Jesuit, who under the Name of *Andreas Philopater*, delivers this excellent Doctrine, *That the whole School of Divines teach, and it is a thing certain, and of Faith, that any Christian Prince, if he manifestly falls off from the Religion of the Catholick Roman Church, and endeavours to draw others from it, doth by Law of God and Man, fall from all Power and Authority; and that before the Sentence of the Pope and Judge delivered against him; and that all his Subjects are free from the Obligation of any Oath to him, of Obedience and Loyalty, and that they may and ought to cast such a one out of his Power as an Apostate and a Heretick, lest he infect others.* I might mention many

more, who write after the same Nature, but I spare you, only this one may serve instead of many; for he delivers it not only as his own Judgment, but the consent of the School, and as a thing most certain, as being of Faith: And will you still say, That no Jesuits own such Principles, as, *That Faith is not to be kept with Hereticks*? For if Heresie doth thus destroy all Obligation to Obedience in Subjects to Heretical Princes, Will it not much more in Princes toward heretical Subjects? Because certainly Princes have a greater Power and Right to command over Subjects, than Subjects over them, even in your own case of Heresie. Since this therefore is the avowed Doctrine of the Jesuitical School, perswade whom you can to believe, that you look on an Obligation to Faith remaining in a case of Heresie? Certainly, none who

¶ 7.

*Scilicet has artes nuper gens gnara nocendi
Exitio invexit, Gallia, nata tuo.
Hesperia fuscis gens emissaria ab oris
Fucum affectat à qua gravitate tegit,
Nata Magistratum convellere, nata Ministris
Substrabere obsequium, Præsulibusq; suum:
Geryonæ quæ dum placeat, faveatq; trifauci,
Terrarum reliquos non facit assis heros.
Et: calo facinus dignum putat, omnia sævi
In Regis longas tradere sceptræ manus.
Quæ disciplinam morum, quæ Gallica venit,
Exuto, legum solvere jura, metu,
Et vileis regnantem animas, ipsosq; necandos
Horrendâ Reges proditiōe docet;
Servandamq; fidem negat, argutisq; cavillis
Detorquet magni jussa severa Dei.
Nos patimur segnes, lentisq; sedemus ad iram,
Et pietas ipsâ religione perit.
Protinus Induciæ violantur patre Quiritum
Aulore, & Martis nuncius iræ venit.
Nos juvat antiquæ vitæ producere ritu,
Nos juvat in prisca simplicitate mori.
Jac. Aug. Thuan. Eleg. in Parricidas.*

*Universa Theologorum Schola tenet, & est
certum ac de fide; Quicumque principem
Christianum, si à Catholica Romana Reli-
gione manifestâ dislexerit, & alios advocare
voluerit, excidere statim omni potestate, &
Dignitate ex ipsâ vi Juris Divini & Hu-
mani: hocque & ante sententiam Pontifi-
cis & Judicis contra ipsum prolata; &
subditos quoscunque liberos esse ab omni Ju-
ramenti Obligatione, quod de Obedientiâ
præstitissent, posseque & debere hujusmodi
hominem tanquam Apostatam & hereti-
cum ex dominatu ejicere, nâ alios inficiat.
Andreas Philopater Resp. ad Edict. Regin.
Angl. p. 149. n. 157.*

un-

P. 156. understand your Principles and Practices, will have much cause to rely on your Faith in this Particular. So much at present of the Jesuits Integrity, as to his Principle of *keeping Faith with Hereticks*. What you add further about the Council of *Constance*, and *John Husse*, and *Hierom of Prague*, is only serving up the very same Matter, in somewhat different Words; for there is nothing contained in them, but what hath been sufficiently disproved already: for it all depends on the nature of the Safe-conduct, and the difference of the Secular and Ecclesiastical Power.

¶ 8. His Lordship very pertinently asks, *Supposing Men might go safely to Rome, To what Purpose is it to go to a General Council thither, and use Freedom of Speech, since the Church of Rome is resolved to alter nothing; and you very pertinently answer, That they were invited thither to be better instructed, and reclaimed from their Errors.*

P. 157. But, Will no Place serve to reclaim them but Rome? Can they not be as well instructed elsewhere, and by other Means, than by being summoned to a *General Council*? We had thought the Intention of *General Councils* had been to have had free Debates concerning the Matters which divide the Church. But, it seems the Protestants must have been summoned as guilty Persons, *i. e.* Hereticks, and their Adversaries must have sat as their proper Judges, and such who were accused as the great Innovators, must have believed themselves Infallible, and by your own Saying, *If an Angel from Heaven had come as a Protestant thither*, he would not have been believed; nay, it had been well he had escaped so, if your Power were as great over Spirits, as over our grosser Bodies. So I suppose *John Husse*, and *Hierom of Prague* were invited to *Constance* to be better instructed; and it is well we know by their Example, what you mean by your good *Instructions*, and out of a desire to avoid them, care not how little we appear, where our Adversaries not only intend to be Judges, but resolve beforehand to condemn us whatsoever we say: For so you tell us, *That Rome, and the Fathers of Trent were resolved to stick to their own Doctrine* (which they call *Catholick*) *notwithstanding any pretended Difficulties or Objections brought against it, either by Bishops, or any other Person.* Your kind Invitations then of the Protestants, were wonderful Expressions of your Churches Civility towards them; that they might be present to hear themselves condemned, and then escape how they could themselves.

The offer of a publick Disputation, his Lordship truly tells you, *signifies nothing, without an indifferent Arbitration, and the Impossibility of agreeing on that, renders the other useless*; and only becomes such Thraasonical Persons as *Campian* was, who yet had as little Reason as any Man to boast of his Achievements in his Disputations. When you therefore say, *His Lordship would have some Atheist, Turk or Jew, to sit as indifferent Persons*; you shew only your Scurrility, and want of Understanding. For his Lordship only insists on the Necessity of that, to shew the uselessness of publick Disputations, where such cannot be agreed on, as in this case. And he truly saith, *This is a good Answer to all such Offers; that the Kings and Church of England had no Reason to admit of a publick Dispute with the English Romish Clergy, till they shall be able to shew it under the Seal or Powers of Rome, that that Church will submit to a Third, who may be an indifferent Judge between us and them; or to such a General Council as is after mentioned* (not such a one as you would have, wherein the Pope should sit as Head of the Church, for that is to make the greatest Criminal, Judge in his own Cause.) *And this*, saith he, *is an honest, and; I think, a full Answer. And without this, all Disputation must end in Clamour; and therefore the more Publick, the worse. Because, as the Clamour is the greater, so perhaps will be the Schism too.*

P. 185.

148:1.B.

C H A P. IV.

The Reformation of the Church of England justified.

The Church of Rome guilty of Schism, by unjustly casting Protestants out of Communion. The Communion of the Catholick and particular Churches distinguished. No Separation of Protestants from the Catholick Church. The Devotions of the Church of England and Rome compared. Particular Churches Power to reform themselves in case of general Corruption, proved. The Instance from the Church of Judah vindicated. The Church of Rome paralleled with the Ten Tribes. General Corruptions make Reformation the more necessary. Whether those things we condemn as Errors, were Catholick Tenets at the Time of the Reformation. The contrary shewed, and the difference of the Church of Rome before and since the Reformation. When things may be said to be received as Catholick Doctrines. How far particular Churches Power to reform themselves extends. His Lordship's Instances for the Power of Provincial Councils in Matters of Reformation vindicated. The particular Case of the Church of England discussed. The Proceedings in our Reformation defended. The Church of England a true Church. The National Synod 1562. a lawful Synod. The Bishops no Intruders in Queen Elizabeth's Time. The Justice and Moderation of the Church of England in her Reformation. The Pope's Power here, a forcible fraudulent Usurpation.

HAVING thus far examined your Doctrine, Of keeping Faith with Heretics, we now return to the main Business concerning Schism. And his Lordship saying, *That there is difference between Departure out of the Church, and causeless thrusting from you; and therefore denying, that it is in your Power to thrust us out of the Church; You answer by a Concession, That we were thrust out from the Church of Rome, but that it was not without Cause:* Which, that you might not seem to say gratis, you pretend to assign the Causes of our Expulsion. So that by your own Confession, the present Division or Separation lies at the Church of Rome's Door, if it be not made evident, that there were most just and sufficient Reasons for her casting the Protestants out of her Communion. If therefore the Church of Rome did thrust the Protestants from her Communion, for doing nothing but what became them as Members of the Catholick Church, then that must be the Schismatical Party, and not the Protestants. For, supposing any Church (though pretending to be never so Catholick) doth restrain her Communion within such narrow and unjust Bounds, that she declares such excommunicate, who do not approve all such Errors in Doctrine and Corruptions in Practice, which the Communion of such a Church may be liable to, the cause of that Division which follows, falls upon that Church which exacts those Conditions from the Members of her Communion: That is, when the Errors and Corruptions are such as are dangerous to Salvation. For in this case, that Church hath first divided her self from the Catholick Church; for, the Communion of that lying open and free to all, upon the necessary Conditions of Christian Communion, whatever Church takes upon her to limit and inclose the Bounds of the Catholick, becomes thereby divided from the Communion of the Catholick Church. and all such who disown such an unjust Inclosure, do not so much divide from the Communion of that Church so inclosing, as return to the Communion of the Primitive and Universal Church. The Catholick Church therefore lies open and free, like a Common-Field to all Inhabitants; now if any particular

p. 1.

P. 146. §. 22.

P. 185. n. 1.

Number of these Inhabitants should agree together, to enclose part of it, without Consent of the rest, and not to admit any others to their right of Common, without consenting to it, which of these two Parties, those who deny to yield their Consent; or such who deny their Rights if they will not, are guilty of the Violation of the publick and common Rights of the Place? Now this is plainly the case between the Church of *Rome*, and Ours? The Communion of the Catholick Church lies open to all such who own the Fundamentals of Christian Faith, and are willing to join in the Profession of them: Now to these your Church adds many particular Doctrines, which have no Foundation in Scripture, or the Consent of the Primitive Church; these, and many Superstitious Practices, are enjoined by her, as Conditions of her Communion, so that all those are debarred any right of Communion with her, who will not approve of them; by which it appears, your Church is guilty of the first Violation of the Union of the Catholick; and whatever Number of Men are deprived of your Communion, for not consenting to your Usurpations, do not divide themselves from you, any further than you have first separated your selves from the Catholick Church. And when your Church by this Act is already separated from the Communion of the *Catholick Church*, the disowning of those things wherein your Church is become Schismatical, cannot certainly be any culpable Separation. For, whatever is so, must be from a Church so far as it is Catholick; but in our case it is from a Church so far only as it is not Catholick, *i. e.* so far as it hath divided her self from the Belief and Communion of the *Universal Church*.

¶ 2.

P. 159.

But herein a great Mistake is committed by you, when you measure the Communion of the *Catholick Church*, by the Judgment of all, or most of the particular Churches of such an Age, which supposes that the Church of some *one particular Age*, must of necessity be preserved from all Errors and Corruptions, which there is no Reason or Necessity at all to assert; and that is all the ground you have for saying, *That the Separation of Protestants was not only from the Church of Rome, but (as Calvin confesseth) à toto mundo, from the whole Christian World, and such a Separation necessarily involves Separation from the true Catholick Church.* Now to this, we answer two things, 1. That we have not separated from the whole Christian World in any thing wherein the whole Christian World is agreed; but to disagree from the particular Churches of the Christian World, in such things wherein those Churches differ among themselves, is not to separate from the Christian World, but to disagree in some things from such particular Churches. As I hope you will not say, That Man is divided from all Mankind, who doth in some Feature or other differ from any one particular Man; but, altho' he doth so, he doth not differ from any in those things, which are common to all; for that were to differ from all; but when he only differs from one in the Colour of his Eyes, from another in his Complexion, another in the Air of his Countenance, and so in other things; this Man, though he should differ from every particular Man in the World in something or other, yet is a Man still as well as any, because he agrees with them in that in which they all agree, which is, Humane Nature, and differs only in those Things wherein they differ from each other. And therefore from the Disagreement of the Protestants from any one particular Church, it by no means follows, that they separated from the whole Christian World, and therefore from the true Catholick Church. 2. The Communion of the Catholick Church is not to be measured by the particular Opinions and Practices of all, or any particular Churches, but by such things which are the proper Foundations of the Catholick Church. For there

there can be no Separation from the true Catholick Church, but in such things wherein it is Catholick; now it is not Catholick in any thing, but what properly relates to its Being and Constitution. For whatever else there is, however universal it may be, is extrinsecal to the Nature and Notion of the Catholick Church, and therefore supposing a Separation from the Church, in what is so extrinsecal and accidental, it is no proper Separation from the Catholick Church. As for Instance, supposing all Men were agreed, that some particular Habit should be worn all over the World, will you say, That any Number of Men who found this Habit extremely inconvenient for them, and therefore should disuse it, did on that Account separate from humane Nature, and ceased to be Men by it? Such is the case of any particular Churches laying aside some Customs or Ceremonies, which in some one Age of the Church, or more, the greatest part of Christian Churches were agreed in the Practice of; for, although this general Practice should make Men more diligent in Enquiry, and careful in what they did; yet if such a Church having Power to govern it self, see Reason to alter it, it doth not separate from the Communion of the Catholick Church therein, and therefore doth not cease to be a Church. For there is no culpable Separation from the Church Catholick, but what relates to it properly as Catholick; now that doth not relate to it as Catholick, which it may be Catholick without. Now certainly you cannot have so little Reason as to assert, that the Church cannot be Catholick without such extrinsecal and accidental Agreements. And from hence it follows, That no Church can be charged with a Separation from the true Catholick Church, but what may be proved to separate it self in some thing necessary to the Being of the Catholick Church; and so long as it doth not separate as to these Essentials, it cannot cease to be a true Member of the Catholick Church. If you would therefore prove, that the Church of England, upon the Reformation, is separated from the true Catholick Church; you must not think it enough to say, (which as weakly as commonly is said) *That no one particular Church can be named, which in all things agreed with it*; for that only proves, that she differed from particular Churches in such Things wherein they differed from each other, but that she is divided from all Christian Churches in such Things wherein they are all agreed, and which are essential to the Being of the Catholick Church; when you have proved this, you may expect a further Answer.

This then can be no cause why your Church should expel the Protestants out of her Communion, but it shews us sufficient Cause to believe, that your Church had separated her self from the Communion of the Catholick. For which we must further consider, that although nothing separates a Church properly from the Catholick, but what is contrary to the Being of it; yet a Church may separate her self from the Communion of the Catholick, by taking upon her to make such Things the necessary Conditions of her Communion, which never were the Conditions of Communion with the Catholick Church. As for Instance, Though we should grant, *Adoration of the Eucharist, Invocation of Saints, and Veneration of Images* to be only superstitious Practices taken up without sufficient Grounds in the Church, yet since it appears, that the Communion of the Catholick Church was free for many Hundred Years, without approving or using these things; that Church which shall not only publicly use, but enjoy such things upon pain of Excommunication from the Church, doth, as much as in her lies, draw the Bounds of Catholick Communion within her self, and so divides her self from the true Catholick Church. For, whatever confines, must likewise divide the Church; for by that Confinement a Separation is made between

the part confined, and the other, which Separation must be made by the Party so limiting Christian Communion. As it was in the Case of the *Danists*, who were therefore justly charged with Schism, because they confined the *Catholick Church* within their own Bounds: And if any other Church doth the same which they did, it must be liable to the same Charge which they were, The sum then of this Discourse is, That the Being of the *Catholick Church* lies in Essentials, that for a particular Church to disagree from all other particular Churches in some extrinsecal and accidental Things, is not to separate from the *Catholick Church*, so as to cease to be a Church; but still, whatever Church makes such extrinsecal Things the necessary Conditions of Communion, so as to cast Men out of the Church, who yield not to them, is Schismatical in so doing; for it thereby divides it self from the *Catholick Church*: and the Separation from it, is so far from being Schism, that being cast out of that Church on those Terms only, returns them to the Communion of the *Catholick Church*. On which Grounds it will appear, that yours is the Schismatical Church, and not ours. For, although before this imposing Humour came into particular Churches, Schism was defined by the Fathers, and others, to be a *voluntary departure out of the Church*, yet that cannot in Reason be understood of any particular, but the *true Catholick Church*; for not only Persons, but Churches may depart from the *Catholick Church*; and in such Cases, not those who depart from the Communion of such Churches, but those Churches which departed from the Catholick, are guilty of the Schism.

These things I thought necessary to be further explained, not only to shew, how false that Impuration is, of our Churches departing from the true *Catholick Church*, but with what Reason we charge your Church with departing from the Communion of it; and therefore not those whom you thrust out of Communion, but your Church so thrusting them out, is apparently guilty of the present Schism.

P. 158. n. 1.

But still you say, *Your Church had sufficient cause for the Expulsion of Protestants out of her Communion*; and for this you barely repeat your former Assertions, and offer not at the Proof of one of them; as though you intended to carry your Cause, by the frequent repeating your Declaration. But, Sir, it is the Proof of what you say, that we expect from you, and not the bare telling us, *That Protestants are Schismatics*, because they are Schismatics. When you will be at leisure to prove, that the Protestants were guilty of *Heretical Doctrine, or Schismatical Proceedings*; that they raised a *new, separate, and mutinous Faction of pretended Christians, distinct from the one Catholick Body of the Church*; by *choosing new Pastors, instituting new Rites and Ceremonies not in their Power to do, by Schismatical convening in several Synods, and there broaching new heretical Confessions of Faith*; when I say, You shall think good to prove all, or any one of these, you shall receive so full an Answer as will make it evident, that the Protestants did not depart from the *Catholick Churches Doctrine and Communion*; but that the Church of *Rome*, is departed thence, first, by imposing erroneous Doctrines, and superstitious Practices, as Conditions of Communion, and then by thrusting out all such as would not Consent to them.

¶ 4.

P. 146. n. 22.

His Lordship disputing the Terms on which a Separation in the Church may be lawful, saith, *That Corruption in Manners only, is no sufficient Cause to make a Separation in the Church*. And, saith he, *This is as ingenuously confessed for you, as by me*. For if *Corruption in Manners* were a just Cause of actual Separation of one Church from another, in that *Catholick Body of Christ*, the Church of *Rome* hath given as great cause as any, since (as Stapleton grants)

grants) there is scarce any Sin that can be thought on by Man (Heresie only excepted) with which that Church hath not been foully stained, especially from eight hundred Tears after Christ. And he need not except Heresie, into which Biel grants it possible, the Bishops of the See may fall. And Stella and Almain grant it freely, that some of them did fall, and so ceased to be Heads of the Church, and left Christ (God be thanked) at that time of his Vicar's Defection, to look to his Cure himself. But you tell us, The Discovery of some few Motes, darkens not the Brightness of the Sunshine; I wonder what you account Beams, if the Sins of your Popes and others be but Motes with you? We grant, that the Sun himself hath his Macule, but they are such as do not Eclipse his Light; we find the Maculae in your Church, but we are to seek for the bright Sunshine. Or, Doth it lie in the Service of your Religious Votaries? For that is the great part of the conspicuous Piety of your Church, which you instance in. But, Is this indeed the bright Sunshine of your Church, that there are so many thousands of both Sexes (you do well to joyn them together) who tie themselves by perpetual Vows, never to be dissolved by their own seeking (and therefore doubtless pleasing to God, whether they are able to keep them or no) and these pray (if they understand what they say) and sing Divine Hymns Day and Night (which makes the Sun shine the brighter) which you say is a strange and unheard of thing among Protestants. What, that Men and Women (though not in Cloysters) pray and sing Hymns to God? no surely. For as the Devotion of our Churches is more grave and solemn, so it is likewise more pious and intelligible. You pray and sing, but how? Let Erasmus speak, who understood your praying and singing well. *Cantiuncularum, clamorum, murmurum ac bomborum ubique plus satis est, si quid ista delectant Superos.* Do you think those Prayers and Hymns are pleasing to God, which lie more in the Throat than the Heart? And such who have been wise and devout Men among your selves have been the least Admirers of your mimical, uncouth, and superstitious Devotions; but have rather condemned them as vain, ludicrous things; and wondered (as Erasmus said) what they thought of Christ, who imagined he could be pleased with them. (*Quid sentiunt obsecro de Christo qui putant eum ejusmodi cantiunculis delectari?*) Are these then the glorious Parts of your Devotions, your Prayers and Hymns? But they pray and sing Divine Hymns Day and Night: If this be the only Excellency of your Devotion, How much are you out-done by the ancient Psalliani and Eucharistae, that spent all their Time in Prayer, and yet were accounted Hereticks for their Pains? Still you pray and sing, but to whom? To Saints and Angels often, to the Virgin Mary with great Devotion, and most solemn Invocations; but to God himself, very sparingly in Comparison. If this then be the warm Sunshine of your Devotions, we had rather use such, wherein we may be sure of God's Blessing; which we cannot be in such Prayers and Hymns which attribute those Honours to his Creatures, which belong wholly to himself. But you not only sing and pray, but can be very idle too; and the Number of those Men must be called Religious Orders, and the Garment of the Church is said by you to be imbroidered by the Variety of them; and for this, Psalm 44. 10. is very luckily quoted. And are those indeed the Ornaments of your Church, which were become such Sinks of Wickedness, that those of your Church, who had any Modesty left were ashamed of them, and call'd loud for a Reformation? Those were indeed

Erasm. in
Mat. 6. 7.

Hodie videmus Sacerdotes, nihil dicam qualibus, sed etiam nimium prolixis precibus, hisque prescriptis, aliquoties ineptis ac ridiculis, ne dicam impiis, oneratos. Erasmus in Mat. 6. 7. Ad haec qui modesti pii sunt, tacite secum ingemiscunt: qui populi malis amentur, et quorum interest Christi gregem, quem ille suo sanguine liberum reddidit, quam maxime servum esse et obnoxium, adeo non reclamant ut modis omnibus exaggerent. Accedunt illi qui vel ambiunt premium aliquod obsequii vel timent poenam libertatis. Ita dum magno succurrunt, res paulatim eo prolabitur ut pone nihil jam pudeat. Id. in Mat. 11. 30.

indeed such *Gardens* wherein it were more worth looking for *useful or odouriferous flowers* (as you express it) than for *Diogenes* to find out an honest man in his Croud of Citizens. Therefore not to dispute with you the first Institutions of *Monastick Life*, nor how commendable the Nature of it is, nor the Conveniences of it, where there are no indispensable Vows; the main Things we blame in them, are, the Restraints of men's Liberties, whatever Circumstances they are in, the great Degeneracy of them in all Respects from their Primitive Institutions, the great Snares which the Consciences of such as are engaged in them, are almost continually exposed to, the unusefulness of them in their multitudes to the *Christian World*, the general Unserviceableness of the Persons who live in them, the great Debaucheries which they are subject to, and often over-run with; and if these then be the greatest Ornaments of your Churches Garments, it is an easie Matter to espy the Spots which she hath upon her. What you add concerning the good Lives of Papists and bad of Protestants, if taken universally, is as unjust as uncharitable; if indefinitely, it shews only that not the particular Lives of men on either side, but the Tendency of the Doctrine, to promote or hinder the Sanctity of them, is here to be regarded. And to that you speak afterwards, but in a most false and virulent manner, when you say, *That though sins be committed among you, they are not defended or justified as good works; whereas, among Protestants, Darknes it self is called Light, and the greatest of all Sins, viz. Heresie, Schism, Sacrilege, Rebellion, &c. together with all the bad spawn they leave behind them, are cryed up for perfect Virtue, Zeal, good Reformation, and what not?* I doubt not but you would be ready to defend and justifie this open Raillery of yours, and call it a good Work, notwithstanding what you said before. If we had a mind to follow you in such Things, How easie a matter were it to rip up all the Frauds, Impostures, Villanies of all sorts and kinds which have been committed by those who have sate in your Infallible Chair, and charge them all on your Church, with much more Justice than you do the Miscarriages of any under the name of Protestants? For the Protestant Churches disown such Persons, and condemn those Practices with the greatest Indignation; whereas you excuse, palliate, and plead for the Lives of the Popes, as much as you dare, and not out-face the Sun at Noon, which hath laid open their Villanies. Where do the Principles of Protestants incourage or plead for Heresie, Schism, Sacrilege, Rebellion, &c. much less cry them up as Heroical Actions? Doth not the Church of England disown and disclaim such Things to the uttermost? Have not her Sufferings made it appear, how great a hater she is of Heresies, Schism, Sacrilege, and Rebellion? Did she ever cry up those for Martyrs, who died in Gun-powder Treasons? Did she ever teach it lawful to disobey Heretical Princes, and to take away their lives? Yet these Things have been done by you, and the Doers of them not condemned, but rather fomented and incouraged, as zealous Promoters of the Holy See, and most devout Sons of the Church of Rome. Cease therefore to charge the guilt of Persons disowned by the Church of England upon her; when you are unwilling to hear of the Faults of those Persons among your selves, whom you dare not disown, I mean your Popes and Jesuits.

P. 160.

p. 5.

Leaving therefore these unbecoming Railleries of yours, and that which occasioneth them, viz. Corruption of Manners; we come to consider that, which is more pertinent to our Purpose, viz. Errors in Doctrine; which his Lordship truly assigned as the ground of the Reformation, and not only that there were doctrinal Errors in your Church, but that some of the Errors of the Roman Church were dangerous to Salvation. For it is not every light Error

P. 147. n. 2.

Error in disputable Doctrine and Points of curious Speculation, that can be a just Cause of Separation, in that admirable Body of Christ, which is his Church, or of one Member of it from another. But, that there are Errors in Doctrine, and some of them such as most manifestly endanger Salvation in the Church of Rome, is evident to them that will not shut their Eyes. The Proof (his Lordship saith) runs through the particular Points, and so is too long for this Discourse. Now to this you manfully answer, That in vain do they attempt to reform the Church of what she can never be guilty. Which, if it depends on your Churches Infallibility (which is largely disproved already) must needs fall to the Ground with it. And it is an excellent Answer when a Church is charged actually with erring, to say, She doth not err, because she cannot: Which is all that you give us here. But if you prove it no better than you have done, the Heretical and Schismatical Obstinacy is like to be found in that Church which in her Errors challenges Infallibility.

P. 160.

The Question now comes to this, Whether, Errors being supposed in the Doctrine, and Corruptions in the Communion of a Church, when the General Church would not reform, it was not lawful for particular Churches to reform themselves? To this his Lordship answers affirmatively, in these Words.

Is it then such a strange thing, that a particular Church may reform it self, if the general will not? I had thought, and do so still, that in Point of Reformation of either Manners or Doctrine, it is lawful for the Church, since Christ, to do as the Church before Christ did, and might do. The Church before Christ consisted of Jews and Proselytes: This Church came to have a Separation, upon a most ungodly Policy of Jeroboam's, so that it never pieced together again. To a Common Council to reform all, they would not come. Was it not lawful for Judah to reform her self, when Israel would not join? Sure it was, or else the Prophet deceives me, that says expressly, Though Israel transgress, yet let not Judah Sin. And S. Hierom expounds it of this very particular Sin of Heresie

P. 149. sect. 24

Hof. 4. 15.

and Error in Religion. After which he proves, That Israel, during this Separation, was a true Church. Which we shall insist on, when we have considered what Answer you return to his Lordship's Argument, which lies in these two things; First, That Judah did not reform her self. Secondly, That Judah is not the Protestant Party, as his Lordship supposeth it to be. First,

P. 160. n. 2.

You say, Judah did not reform her self. For Judah being the Orthodox Church, united with her Head the High Priest, and not tainted with any Doctrinal Errors, What need was there of her Reformation? And so the meaning of that Place, Though Israel transgress, yet let not Judah Sin, is rather against, than for him, because the Sense is rather, Let not Judah fall into Schism, though Israel daes, than, let Judah reform her self. But if it appears that Judah had Corruptions crept into her, as well as Israel had, though not so great, and universal, then it follows, that by these Words Judah had Power to reform her self. And the Antecedent is clear to any one who takes the Pains to read the Scripture, and compare the Places in it, more than it seems you do. For, Doth not this very Prophet check Judah as well as Israel, for

Hof. 6. 47.

Hof. 12. 2.

transgressing God's Covenant? Doth he not say, That God had a Controversie with Judah, and would punish Jacob according to his ways? And for all this, Was there no need of Reformation in the Church of Judah? Indeed, in one place it is said, That Judah ruleth with God, and is faithful with his Saints; but then that is to be understood of Judah, when she had reformed her self in the Days of Hezekiah; for surely you will not say, That Judah did not stand in need of Reformation, when Hezekiah began his Reign; for it is said of him, That he removed the High Places, and brake the Images, and cut down the Groves. And were not these things which wanted

2 King 18. 4.

ed

ed Reformation, think you? If we consider the Times of those three Kings before *Hezekiah*, in which *Hosea* prophesied; we shall see, what need there was of Reformation among them, and those were *Uzziah*, *Jotham*, and *Ahaz*; of the time of *Uzziah*, call'd *Azariah*, in the Book of *Kings*, it is said, *That the High Places were not removed, but the People sacrificed and burnt Incense still on the High Places*; the same is affirmed of the time of *Jotham* in the same Chapter; so that though these Princes were good themselves, yet there were many Corruptions still among the People. But of *Ahaz* it is said expressly, *That he walked in the way of the Kings of Israel; and he sacrificed and burnt Incense in the High Places, and on the Hills, and under every green Tree*. Chuse now which of these three you please (for it is most improbable those Words, considering the long Time of *Hosea's* Prophecy, should be spoken in the Time of *Hezekiah* the last of the four Kings he prophesied under). And will you tell us again, *That the Church of Judah needed no Reformation*? But you offer at a Reason for it, *Because she was united with her Head the High-Priest at Hierusalem*. So then, belike as long as *Judah* and the High-Priest were united, she could be guilty of no Doctrinal Errors: No, not although she should pronounce Christ a Blasphemer, and condemn him to be crucified as a Malefactor; for then certainly *Judah* and the High-Priest were united. But, I know you will say, *You spake this of the Time before the Messias was come*. And was it then true, that as long as *Judah* was united with her Head, the High-Priest, there was no need of Reformation? What think you then of the time of *Ahaz*, when *Uzziah* the Priest built an Altar at the Command of *Ahaz*, according to the Pattern of the Altar of *Damascus*, contrary to God's express Law: yet, according to you, as long as *Judah* was united with her Head, the High-Priest, there was nothing which needed Reformation. And, although it be plainly affirmed, that *Judah kept not the Commands of the Lord their God, but walked in the Statutes of Israel which they had made*; yet you, who, it seems, knew *Judah's* Innocency better than God, or the Prophets did, say very magisterially, That as long as she was united with her Head the High-Priest, what need, I pray, was there of her Reformation? And this being the Case of *Judah*, I may easily grant you, *That Judah is not the Protestant Party, but that of the Roman Church, i. e. while Judah was under her Corruptions*; and yet, you say, *she needed no Reformation*, she is the fittest Parallel you could think of for your Church; but we pretend to no Parallel between *Judah* and the Protestant Party, in *not needing a Reformation*, but in her Power to reform her self. Which we say still, that she had, though *Israel would not join with her*, by virtue of these Words of the Prophet, *Though Israel transgress, yet let not Judah Sin*: thereby manifesting, that though the greatest Part was degenerated in the Ten Tribes, yet *Judah* might prevent the same in herself, by reforming those Abuses which were crept among them; And therefore the Sense of those Words, *Let not Judah Sin*, must in this Case imply a Power to reform her self. If therefore we speak of *Judah* degenerated, we grant the Parallel lies wholly between *Judah* and the Church of *Rome*; for, although there were great Corruptions in *Judah*, and as great in your Church, yet with the same Reason you say, *That neither needed Reformation*: But if we speak of *Judah* reforming herself under *Hezekiah*, then we say, The Parallel lies between *Judah* and the Protestant Party; whatever you say to the contrary. But you shrewdly ask, *If you be Judah, Who, I pray, are the revolted Ten Tribes? Who are of Jeroboam's Cabal*? Even they who set up the Calves at *Dan* and *Bethel*: Such who worship Images instead of the true God; though they intend them only

Ibid.

as

as Symbols of the Divine Presence; for no more did *Jeroboam* and the *Israelites* intend by their Calves, and there is no Pretence which you use to justify your selves from Idolatry, but will excuse *Jeroboam*, and the Ten Tribes from it. If the Protestant Party then be *Judah*, it is easie finding out the revolted Ten Tribes, and *Jeroboam's* Cabal, the Court of *Rome* answering to this, as the Church of *Rome* doth to the other. But we cannot be *Judah*, because we left the *Catholick* Jerusalem, that is *Rome* the City of Peace: By whom, I pray, was *Rome* Christened the *Catholick* Jerusalem? For if we consider the Worship there used, and the politick Ends of it, it much more looks like *Samaria*, or *Dan*, and *Bethel*. If *Rome* be our *Catholick* Jerusalem, shew us, When God made choice of that, for the peculiar Place of his Worship? Where we are commanded to resort thither for Divine Worship? When God placed his Name there, as he did of old in *Jerusalem*? When you have shewed us these Things, we may think the worfe of our selves for leaving *Rome*, but not before. And, let the World judge, Whether it be more likely one should meet with the Worship of Golden Calves at *Rome*, or among the Protestants? It is you who have found out new Sacrifices new Objects of Worship, new Rites and Ceremonies in it, new Altars, and consequently new Priests too; and yet for all this, you must be orthodox *Judah*, which needed no Reformation? And who, I pray, do in point of Obedience most resemble the Ten Tribes? Have not you set up a Spiritual *Jeroboam*, as a new Head of the Church, in Opposition to the Son of David? And that you may advance the Interest of this Spiritual Head, you raise his Authority far above that of Kings and Temporal Princes, whom you ought to be subject to; declaring it in his Power to excommunicate, depose, and absolve Subjects from Obedience to them. And therefore is not the Parallel between the Ten Tribes, and the Church of *Rome*, very pat, and much to the purpose? But when you would seem to return this upon us by a false and scurrilous Parallel between *Jeroboam*, and that excellent Princess Queen Elizabeth in the Reformation of the Church of *England*, you only betray the Badness of your Cause, which makes Detractions so necessary to maintain it: For as her Title to the Crown was undoubted, so her Proceedings in the Reformation were such as are warranted by the Law of God, and the Nation; and her Carriage in her Reign towards Jesuits and Priests no other than what the apparent Necessity of her own and her Kingdoms Preservation put her upon. But if she must be accounted like *Jeroboam*, for banishing Priests and Jesuits often convicted of treasonable Practices, upon pain of Death if they were found in *England*; What must we think of the *Catholick* Jerusalem, the City of Peace, that sweet and gentle Mother the Church of *Rome*, that hath carried her self so peaceably towards those who have dissented from her? Witness the Blood of so many Hundred Thousands which she hath imbrued her Hands in, meerly for opposing her Doctrines and Superstitions, witness that excellent School of Humanity the *Inquisition*, and the easie Lessons she teaches those who come under her Discipline there; witness the Proceedings in *England* in the Days of Queen *Mary*; and then let any judge if the Parallel must be carried by Cruelty towards Dissenters, which of their two Reigns came the nearest that of *Jeroboam*. The only true Words then that you say, are, *but enough of this Parallel*; and more than enough too of such impudent Slanders against the Memory of that famous Queen: But your Church would have been more unlike the Ten Tribes, if there had not been a lying Prophet there.

You dispute very manfully against his Lordship, for asserting, *That Israel remained a Church after the Separation between Judah and the Ten Tribes*;

Z z

and

P. 161.

Ibid.]

P. 162.

and yet, after you have spent many Words about it, you yield all that he asserts; when you say, *That in a general Sense they were called the People of God, as they were Abraham's Seed, according to the Flesh, by Reason of the Promise made to Abraham, I will be a God to thee, and to thy Seed after thee.* And what is there more than this, that his Lordship contends for? For he never dreamt that the Ten Tribes were *Abraham's Seed according to the Spirit*; but only says, *That there was Salvation for those Thousands that had not bowed their Knees to Baal, which cannot be in the ordinary Way where there is no Church.* And if, as you say, *Abraham's Seed only according to the Spirit, i. e. the Faithful, make the true Church*; then it follows, Where there were so many faithful, there must needs be a true Church. And thus for any thing you have said to the contrary, his Lordship's Argument from the case of *Judah* holds for every particular Church's Power to reform it self, when the General will not reform.

d. 6.

P. 150. n. 2.

His Lordship further argues, *That to reform what is amiss in Doctrine or Manners, is as lawful for a particular Church, as it is to publish and promulgate any thing that is Catholick in either.* And your Question, *Quo Jndice?* lies alike against both. And yet, I think, saith he, *It may be proved, that the Church of Rome, and that as a particular Church, did promulgate an Orthodox Truth, which was not then Catholickly admitted in the Church; namely, the Procession of the Holy Ghost from the Son. If she erred in this Fact, confess her Error; if she erred not, Why may not another particular Church do as she did?* From whence he infers, *That if a particular Church may publish any thing that is Catholick, where the whole Church is silent; it may reform any thing that is not Catholick, where the whole Church is negligent, or will not.*

P. 162. n. 3.

P. 164.

P. 163.

Now to this you answer, 1. *That this Procession from the Son, was a Truth always acknowledged in the Church*; but what concerns that, and the Time of this Article being inserted into the Creed, have been so amply discussed already, that I shall not cloy the Reader with any Repetition, having fully considered whatever you here say concerning the Article it self, or its Addition to the Creed. 2. You answer, *That the Consequence will not hold, that if a particular Church may in some case promulgate an Orthodox Truth, not as yet Catholickly received by the Church, then a particular Church may repeal, or reverse any thing that the whole Church hath already Catholickly and definitively received? Surely no. Tet this (say you) is his Lordships, and the Protestants Case.* You do well to mention an egregious Fallacy presently after these Words; for surely this is so. For doth his Lordship parallel the Promulgating something Catholick, and repealing something Catholick together? Surely no. But the promulgating something true, but not Catholickly received with the reforming something not Catholick. Either therefore you had a mind to abuse his Lordship's Words, or to deceive the Reader by begging the thing in Question, viz *that all those which we call for a Reformation of, were things Catholickly and definitively received by the whole Church*: which you know we utterly deny. But you go on, and say, *That thence it follows not, that a particular Church may reform any thing that is not Catholick, where the whole Church is negligent, or will not, because this would suppose Error, or something uncatholick, to be taught or admitted by the whole Church.* To put this case a little more plainly by the former Instance; Suppose then that the Worship of God under the Symbols of the Calves at Dan and Bethel, had been received generally as the visible Worship of the Tribes of *Judah* and *Benjamin*, as well as the rest; Doth not this Answer of yours make it impossible that ever they should return to the true Worship of God? For this were to call in question the Truth of God's Promise

to

to his Church; and to suppose something not Catholick to be received by the whole Church. And so the greater the Corruptions are, the more impossible it is to cure them; and in case they spread generally, no Attempts of Reformation can be lawful: which is a more false and paradoxical Doctrine than either of those which you call so. And the Truth is, such Pretences as these are, are fit only for a Church that hateth to be reformed; for if something not good in it self, should happen in any one Age to overspread the visible Communion of all particular Churches, this only makes a Reformation the more necessary; so far is it from making it the more disputable. For thereby those Corruptions grow more dangerous, and every particular Church is bound the more to regard its own Security in a time of general Infection. And if any other Churches neglect themselves, What Reason is it that the rest should? For, any or all other particular Churches neglecting their Duty, is no more an Argument, that no particular Church should reform it self, than that if all other Men in a Town neglect preserving themselves from the Plague, than I am bound to neglect it too. But you answer, 3. *That all this doth not justify the Protestants Proceedings, because they promulged only new and unheard of Doctrines, directly contrary to what the Catholick Church universally held and taught before them for Catholick Truths.* This is the great thing in Question; but I see, you love best the lazy Trade of begging Things, which are impossible to be rationally proved.

But yet you would seem here to do something towards it in the subsequent Words; *For about the Year of our Lord 1517. when their pretended Reformations began, was not the real Presence of our Saviour's Body and Blood in the Eucharist, by a true substantial change of Bread and Wine, generally held by the whole Church? Was not the real Sacrifice of the Mass then generally believed? Was not Veneration of Holy Images, Invocation of Saints, Purgatory, Praying for the dead, that they might be eased of their Pains, and receive the full Remission of their Sins generally used and practised by all Christians? Was not Free Will, Merit of good Works, and Justification by Charity, or inherent Grace, and not by Faith only, universally taught and believed in all Churches of Christendom? Yea, even among those who in some few other Points dissented from the Pope, and the Latin Church? To what purpose then doth the Bishop urge, that a particular Church may publish any thing that is Catholick? This doth not justify at all his Reformation; he should prove that it may not only add, but take away something that is Catholick from the Doctrine of the Church; for this the pretended Reformers did, as well in England as elsewhere.* His Lordship never pretends, much less disputes, that any particular Church hath a Power to take away any thing that is truly Catholick; but the ground why he supposeth, such Things as those mentioned by you, might be taken away, is, because they are not Catholick; the Question then is between us, Whether they were Catholick Doctrines or not: This you attempt to prove by this Medium, *Because they were generally held by the whole Church at the Time of the Reformation.* To which I answer, 1. If this be a certain Measure to judge by, what was Catholick and what not; then what doth not appear to have been Catholick in this Sense, it was in our Churches Power to reject, and so it was lawful to reform our selves as to all such Things which were not at the time of the Reformation received by the whole Church. And what think you now of the Pope's Supremacy, your Churches Infallibility, the necessity of Cælibacy in the Clergy, Communion in one kind, Prayer in an unknown Tongue, Indulgences, &c. Will you say, That those were generally received by the Church at the time of the Reformation? If you could have said so,

p. 7.
Ibid.

no doubt you would not have omitted such necessary Points, and some of which gave the first Occasion to the Reformation. If then these were not Catholickly received, a particular Church might without Schism reject them, and so the Church of *England* is sufficiently vindicated from Schism by your self, as to these Points here mentioned, which you willingly omitted, because you could not but know how far they were from being universally received in all Churches in *Christendom*?

2. As to those Things which you insist on, you give no sufficient Evidence at all, that they were received by the *whole Church as Catholick Doctrines*. For, so far it is from appearing, that these were held as Catholick Doctrines by all Churches in the Christian World (for then you do most unreasonably condemn the *Greek*, and *Abyssine Churches*, &c. for Heresie or Schism, if they owned all Catholick Doctrines; and they must do so, if they agreed with your Church in all these Things, which are the only Doctrines you mention as Catholick, in Opposition to such whom you condemn for Heresie or Schism; and if the Agreement of all Churches be the measure of what is Catholick, then those Doctrines cannot be so, which those great Churches differ from you in, by your own Argument) but, so far is it, I say, from appearing, that these were held so by all Churches in *Christendom*, that you cannot prove they were so held in the Church of *Rome* herself, before the Reformation. The Church of *Rome* I take here in the largest Sense, as it takes in all such who were the visible Members of her Communion. Now, I hope you will not say, That such Doctrines are received as Catholick Doctrines, which are embraced only by a Party in your Church, another Party opposing it, both which still remain Members of your Communion; for whatever is received as a Catholick Doctrine (according to you) is so received, that those who deny or doubt of it, do thereby become no Members of the visible Communion of that Church; which is by the Churches so declaring her self in those Points, that she admits none to her Communion, but upon the Acknowledgement of them. Now, Will you say, This was the case of your Church, as to these Doctrines at the beginning of the *Reformation*? Were *Transubstantiation*, *real Sacrifice* of the *Mass*, *Veneration of Images*, *Invocation of Saints*, *Purgatory*, &c. so defined then by your Church to be Articles of Faith, that whoever did not assent to them, was declared excommunicate, and cast out of your Church? If not, it is impossible, upon your own Grounds, to prove, that these were universally held and believed as Catholick Doctrines of your Church. I do not say, As truly Catholick Doctrines in themselves; for, whatever your Church defines concerning them, they are not more or less so in themselves for your Churches Definition; but, I say, you cannot assert that these were held by your Church to be Catholick Doctrines, till they were defined to be such. For, according to your Principles, that which differenceth a Catholick Doctrine from a particular Opinion, is the Church's Definition; before then the Church had passed a Definition in these Points, they could not be held as Catholick Doctrines. To make this somewhat clearer, because it is necessary for undeceiving those who are told, as you tell us here, That at the Reformation we rejected such Things which were universally owned for Catholick Doctrines, which is so far from being true, that it is impossible they should be owned for such by the Church of *Rome* upon your own Principles. For, I pray, tell us, Are there not several sorts of Opinions among you at this Day, none of which are pretended to be Catholick Doctrines? And this you constantly tell us, when we object to you your Dissentions about them. As for Instance, the *Pope's personal Infallibility*,
the

the Superiority of Pope over General Councils, the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin, the Disputes about Predestination, &c. when we tell you of your Differences in these Points, you answer, That these hinder not the Unity of the Church, because these are only in Matters of Opinion; and that it is not *de fide*, that Men should hold either way. When we demand the Reason of this difference concerning these Things, your Answer is, *That the Church hath defined some Things to be believed, and not others; that what the Church hath defined, is to be looked on as Catholick Doctrine, and the deniers of it are guilty of Heresie; but where the Church hath not defined, those are not Catholick Doctrines, but only at best but pious Opinions, and Men may be good Catholics, and yet differ about them.* I pray, tell me, Is this your Doctrine, or, is it not? If not, there may be Hereticks within your Church, as well as without; if it be your Doctrine, apply it to the Matters in Hand. Were these Things defined by the Church at the beginning of the Reformation? If they were, produce those Definitions for all those Things which you say were owned as Catholick Doctrines then: that we may see, that at least in the Judgment of your Church they were accounted so. Tell us, when and where those Doctrines were defined before the Council of *Trent*? and, I hope you will not say, that was before the beginning of the Reformation. If then there were no such Definitions concerning them, they could not by your Church be accounted as Catholick Doctrines; at the most, they could be but only pious Opinions, as that of the Pope's Infallibility among you is, and consequently Men might be Catholics still, though they disputed or denied them. And how then come the Protestants to be accounted Hereticks in their Reformation, if upon your own Principles, those Things which they denied were then no Catholick Doctrines? Though you should therefore prove more than you have done, That these Points of Doctrine were generally received at the time of the Reformation, yet that by no means proves that they were Catholick Doctrines, unless you make it impossible that meer Opinions should be generally received in your Church. For, if any thing may be generally received in the nature of an Opinion, you cannot prove from the bare general Reception, that it was a Catholick Doctrine: unless you would attempt to prove it by the Notion under which it was received, Whether as an Opinion, or a Catholick Doctrine.

But then you must remember to prove these Things, 1. That all those who did receive it, received it under that Notion; as for Instance, In any one of those Articles by you mentioned, *Transubstantiation, Invocation of Saints, &c.* you must first prove, That all who were in your Church's Communion did believe those Things, which it is impossible for you to do, unless you could prove, that none could be of your Church, unless they believed them; which is again impossible to be done, unless your Church had so defined those Things, that they ceased to be Members of it who did not believe them. Thus, we see, your first Task is rendered impossible, *viz.* to know, Whether all in your Church held these Doctrines or no; but, suppose you knew this, it falls short of your Purpose, unless you can prove, that all those who held these Things, did not hold them as bare Opinions, but as Catholick Doctrines; and this is again as impossible as the former; for, How can you tell, whether they judged these things to be so, unless you knew what their Rule was whereby they judged of Catholick Doctrines? If you knew their Rule, How can you tell, Whether they made a right Use of it or no? or, Whether they made any Use at all of it? or, Whether they did not take up such Opinions by Prejudice, Education, the Judgment of others, and several other Ways, without examining of what Nature

p. 8.

nature or importance the things were. If you think you have a certain Rule to judge of *Catholick Doctrines* by, you must prove that they had the same Rule, and looked upon it as such too: otherwise they might not use it for those Ends, nor be governed at all by it. When you will therefore prove any Doctrines to be *Catholick*, by being generally received, you must remember what brave Impossibilities you have undertaken. But, suppose you could master this too, and prove, that men generally received these as *Catholick Doctrines*; yet, before you can prove, that these are *Catholick Doctrines* from thence, you have a further task yet upon you, which is, to prove it impossible that these men should be out in their Judgment concerning the Nature of an Opinion, and that they could not look on any thing as a *Catholick Doctrine*, but what was really so. For, if they may be mistaken in their Judgment, we are as far to seek as ever, for knowing what are *Catholick Doctrines*, and what not. You must therefore prove the Judgment of all these Persons *infallible* concerning what are *Catholick Doctrines*, and what not: And by that time, the Pope will return you little Thanks for your pains, in making every Member of your Church as *infallible* as himself. If it be then so impossible to prove, that these were received as *Catholick Doctrines*, either from any definition of your Church, or from the general Reception of them among the members of it, you see, what little reason you had to say, *That the Protestants at the beginning of the Reformation, did take away something that was Catholick from the Doctrine of the Church.* Which is notoriously false and inconsistent with your own Principles. If we should therefore grant, that *Transubstantiation, Purgatory, &c. were generally owned in your Church at the time of the Reformation*, the utmost you can prove, is, only that they were owned as *particular Doctrines* by particular Men, but not that they were owned as the *Catholick Doctrines* of your Church. And therefore we deny not, but that *Party and Faction* in your Church which owned and contended for these, had got the upper hand of the other, before the time of the Reformation, so that those who doubted of, or denied them, durst not appear so publicly as their Adversaries did; but they were but a *Party*, and a *Faction* still, and there were many outward Members of your Church, who groaned under the Abuses and Tyrannies of the prevailing *Faction*, and call'd loud for a *Reformation*. As appeared not only by the open Testimonies of some against such Doctrines; the sad Complaint of others for want of Reformation; but by the general sense of the Necessity of it, at the time when it was set upon, the great Applause it met with among all Persons who allowed themselves Liberty to enquire into Things, the general consent of the main Bodies of those who set about reforming themselves in the main Articles of *Christian Doctrine*, and *unanimous Opposition* to those erroneous Opinions which you call *Catholick Doctrines*. So that these were not at the time of the Reformation. so much as the owned *Catholick Doctrines* of the *Roman Church*; but the Opinions of a *prevailing Faction* in it: and therefore the disowning them, is no rejecting any thing *Catholick*, but rejecting the Opinions and Practices of a tyrannical and usurping *Faction*. There must be then a great deal of difference put between the State and Doctrine of the Church of *Rome*, before the beginning of the Reformation, and since, especially since the *Council of Trent*. For then these *Doctrines* were owned by a *Faction*, but yet there might have been Communion with that Church, without believing them to be *Catholick Doctrines*; and no doubt, many pious Souls went to Heaven without believing any of these Things, (*viz.* such who believed and improved the common Principles of *Christianity*,

rianity, without regarding the erroneous Doctrines, or superstitious Practices of those among whom they lived) but upon the first Stirrings towards a Reformation, the Court of *Rome* was so far from reforming the Abuses which were complained of, that they sought to enforce them with the greatest Severity upon all Persons, thundering out Excommunications against all such who should question or dispute them. By which Means those who might have lived peaceably before within the external Communion of that Church, without consenting to the Errors of it, are now forced out of it, unless they would approve of such Things which their Consciences detested; in Comparison with the Peace of which, they accounted not their Lives to be dear to them, as many Thousands of them made it appear in several Countries. This is the true and just Account of the State of things at the beginning of the Reformation; but afterwards, when through the Necessity of the Pope's Affairs, a Council was summoned, and all the Arts imaginable were made use of, to steer that grand Affair for the Interest of the Court of *Rome*; a new Scene of Affairs appears in the Christian World; those Doctrines which before were owned only by particular Men, are defined by Pope and Council, to be the Catholick Doctrines of the *Roman Church*, and all those Anathematized who will not own them. By which means the *Roman Church* is become it self that Party and Faction, which only prevailed in it before but with Reluctancy and Opposition; and now, none are looked on as Members of that Church, but such as own the Definitions of that Council in point of Doctrine. Which makes it vastly to differ from what it was before, as to the Terms of its Communion, and the state of the Persons who remain in it, who can neither enjoy that freedom in Judgment which they might use before, nor yet can pretend those Excuses for not knowing the Errors and Corruptions of that Church, which might have prevented Obstinacy in them before. So that upon the whole it appears, that the Protestants in the beginning of the Reformation, were so far from taking away any thing that was received as a Catholick Doctrine, by all Christian Churches, that they did not reject any thing which could be looked on as the Catholick Doctrine of the Church of *Rome*; and consequently that the Protestants were so far from a wilful Separation from the Church of *Rome*, that they were driven out by a prevalent Faction, which imposed those Things which had been before only the Errors of particular Persons, as the Catholick Doctrines of that Church, and the necessary Conditions of Communion with her.

3. I may answer yet further, That it is not enough to prove any Doctrine to be Catholick, that it was generally received by Christian Churches in any one Age; but it must be made appear, to have been so received from the Apostles times. So that if we should grant, that these Doctrines were owned for Catholick, not only by the Church of *Rome*, but all other Christian Churches (so far as it can be discerned by their Communion) yet this doth not prove these Doctrines so owned to be truly Catholick, unless you can first prove, that all the *Christian Churches of one Age* can never believe a Doctrine to be Catholick, which is not so. You see therefore your Task increases further upon you: for, it is not enough to say, That *A. D. 1517.* such and such Doctrines were looked on as Catholick, and therefore they were so; but that for 1517. Years, successively from the Apostles to that Time, they were judged to be so, and then we shall more easily believe you. When you will therefore prove *Transubstantiation*, the *Sacrifice of the Mass*, *Image-Worship*, *Invocation of Saints*, or any other of the good Doctrines mentioned by you, in a constant Tradition from the Apostles Times to have been looked

looked on as Catholick Doctrines, you may then say. That Protestants in denying these, did take away something Catholick from the Doctrine of the Church; but, till that time, these Answers may abundantly suffice.

§. 9.

P. 164. n. 6.

We now come closer to the Business of the Reformation; but, before we examine the Particulars of it, the general Grounds on which it proceeded, must somewhat further be cleared, which his Lordship tells you, are built upon the Power of particular Churches reforming themselves, in case the whole Church is negligent, or will not; to which you say, *That you grant in effect as great Power as the Bishop himself does, to particular Churches, to National and Provincial Councils, in reforming Errors and Abuses either of Doctrine or Practice: only we require that they proceed with due respect to the chief Pastor of the Church, and have Recourse to him in all Matters, and Decrees of Faith, especially when they define or declare Points not generally known and acknowledged to be Catholick Truths.* What you grant in effect at first, you in effect deny again afterwards. For the Question is about Reformation of such Errors and Abuses as may come from the Church of Rome; and when you grant a Power to reform only, in case the Pope consent, you grant no Power to reform at all. For the Experience of the World hath sufficiently taught us, How little his Consent is to be expected in any thing of Reformation. For his Lordship truly saith, in Answer to *Capellus*, who denies particular Churches any Power of making Canons of Faith, without consulting the Roman See, *That as Capellus can never prove that the Roman*

P. 151. n. 3.

See must be consulted with before any Reformation be made: So it is as certain, that, were it proved and practised, we should have no Reformation. For it would be long enough before the Church should be cured, if that See alone should be her Physician, which in Truth is her Disease. Now to this you say, *That even Capellus himself requires this;* as though *Capellus* were not the Man whom his Lordship answers as to this very thing. But besides you say, *The Practice of the Church is evident for it, in the Examples of the Milevitan and Carthaginian Councils, which, as St. Austin witnesseth, sent their Decrees touching Grace, Original Sin in Infants, and other Matters against Pelagius, to be confirmed by the Pope;* but what is all this to the Business of Reformation, that nothing of that Nature is to be attempted without the Pope's Consent? That these Councils did by *Julius* an African Bishop, communicate their Decrees to Pope *Innocent*, who denies? but, what is it you would thence infer to your Purpose? For the utmost which can be drawn hence, is, that they desired the Pope to contribute his Assistance in condemning *Pelagius* and *Cælestius*; by adding the Authority of the Apostolical See to their Decrees: that so by the Consent of the Church, that growing Heresie might the more easily be suppressed. And who denies but at that time the Roman Church had great Reputation, (which is all that Authority implies) and by that Means might be more serviceable in preventing the growth of *Pelagianism*, if it did concur with the African Councils in condemning that Doctrine? But because they communicated their Decrees to Pope *Innocent*, desiring his Consent with them, that therefore no Reformation should be attempted in the Church, without the Consent of the Pope is a very far-fetched Inference; and unhappily drawn from those African Fathers, who so stoutly opposed *Zosimus*, *Innocent's* Successor, in the case of Appeals about the Business of *Apiarius*. Did they, think you, look on themselves as obliged to do nothing in the reforming the Church without the Pope's Authority, who would by no Means yield to those Encroachments of Power, which *Zosimus* would have usurped over them? Nay it appears, that, till the African Fathers had better informed him,

Zosimus

Zosimus did not a little favour *Celestius* himself, and in case he had gone on so to do, do you think they would have thought themselves ever the less obliged to reform their Churches from the *Pelagian* Heresie which began to spread among them? And in this time of the Controversie between *Zosimus* and them, though they carried it with all Fairness towards the Roman See, yet they were still careful to preserve and defend their own Privileges; and in case the Pope should then have challenged that Power over them, which he hath done since, no doubt they would not have stuck at calling such Incroachments *The Disease of the Church*, (without any Unhandsomeness or Incivility) and would have been far from looking on him as the only Physician of it.

To that Pretence, *That Things should have been born with, till the Time of a General Council*, his Lordship answers: *First, 'tis true, a General Council, free and entire, would have been the best Remedy, and most able for a Gangrene that had spread so far, and eaten so deep into Christianity. But what? should we have suffered this Gangrene to endanger Life and all, rather than be cured in Time by a Physician of weaker Knowledge, and a less able Hand? Secondly, we live to see since, if we had stayed and expected a General Council, what manner of one we should have had if any. For that at Trent was neither General nor free. And for the Errars which Rome had contracted, it confirmed them, it cured them not. And yet I much doubt, whether ever that Council such as it was) would have been call'd, if some Provincial and National Synods under Supreme and Regal Power, had not first set upon this great Work of Reformation; which I heartily wish had been as orderly and happily pursued, as the Work was right Christian and good in it self. But humane Frailty and the Heats and Distempers of Men, as well as the Cunning of the Devil would not suffer that. For even in this Sense also the Wrath of Man doth not accomplish the Will of God, S. James 1. 20. but I have learnt not to reject the good which God hath wrought, for any Evil which Men may fasten upon it. Now to this you answer, 1. By a fair Concession again, that a Provincial Council is the next Chirurgeon, when a Gangrene endangers Life, but still the Pope's Assistance is required: For fear the Chirurgeon should do too much good of himself, you would be sure to have the Pope as Physician to stand by, whom you know too much concerned in the Maladies of the Church, to give way to an effectual Cure. 2. But you say further, That the most proper Expedient is an Oecumenical Council; and this you spoil again, with saying; Such as the Council of Trent was. For what you say in Vindication of that being General and free, we shall consider in the Chapter designed for that purpose. What you object against our National Synod 1562. will be fully answered before the end of this; which that we may make way for, we must proceed to the Remainder of these general Grounds, in which his Lordship proves, That when the Universal Church will not, or for the Iniquity of the Times cannot, obtain and settle a free General Council, 'tis lawful, nay sometimes necessary to reform gross Abuses by a National or a Provincial. To this you answer in General, That you deny not but Matters of less moment as concerning Rites and Ceremonies, Abuses in Manners and Discipline, may be reformed by particular Councils, without express Leave of the Pope; but that in matters of great moment concerning the Faith and publick Doctrine of the Church, Sacraments, and whatever else is of Divine Institution, or universal Obligation, particular Councils (if they duly proceed) attempt nothing without recourse to the See Apostolick, and the Pope's Consent either expressly granted or justly presumed. Fair Hopes then there are of a Cure, when the Imposthume gathers in the Head! we are indeed by this put into a very good Condi-*

A a a

tion;

p. 10.
P. 152. n. 4.

P. 165.

P. 157. n. 5.

P. 166. n. 8.

tion; for if a small matter hurts a Church, she hath her Hands at liberty to help her self; but if one comes to ravish her, her Hands are tyed, and by no means must she defend her self. For in case, say you, it be *any matter of great moment, it must be left to the Pope, and nothing to be done without his Consent*; no not although the main of the Distempers come through him. But thanks be to God, our Church is not committed to the Hands of such a merciless Physician, who first causeth the Malady, and then forbids the Cure; we know of no such Obligation we have, to sleep in *S. Peter's Church*, as of old they did in the Temple of *Æsculapius* in hopes of a Cure. God hath entrusted every National Church with the care of her own Safety, and will require of her an account of that Power he hath given to that end. It will be little Comfort to a Church whose Members Rot for want of a Remedy, to say, *The Pope will not give leave* or else it might have been cured. I wonder where it is that any Christian Church is commanded to wait the Pope's good Leaseure for reforming her self? Whence doth he derive this Authority and sole Power of reforming Churches? But that must be afterwards examined. But is it reasonable to suppose that there should be Christian Magistrates, and Christian Bishops in Churches, and yet these so tyed up, that they can do nothing in order to the Church's Recovery, though the Distempers be never so great and dangerous? Do we not read in the Apostolical Churches, that the Government of them was in themselves, without any the least mention of any Occumenical Pastor over all? If any Abuses were among them, the particular Governours of those Churches are checked and rebuked for it, and commanded to exercise their Power over Offenders? And must the Encroachments of an usurped and arbitrary Power in the Church, hinder particular Churches from the exercise of that full power which is committed to the Governours of them? Neither is this only a Right granted to a Church as such, but we find this Power practised and asserted in the History of the Christian Churches from the Apostles Times. For no sooner did the Bishops of *Rome* begin to encroach, but other Bishops were so mindful of their own Privileges and the Interest of their Churches, that they did not yield themselves his Vassals, but disputed their Rights, and withstood his Usurpations. As hath partly appeared already, and will do more afterwards.

- ¶ II. And that particular Churches may reform themselves, his Lordship produceth several Testimonies; The first is of *Gerson*, who tells us plainly,
P. 153. *That he will not deny, but that the Church may be reformed by Parts. And that this is necessary; and, that to effect it, Provincial Councils may suffice, and in some Things Diocesan.* And again, *Either you should reform all Estates of the Church in a General Council, or command them to be reformed in Provincial Councils: But all this, you say, doth not concern Matters of Faith, but only personal Abuses*; But I pray what ground is there that one should be reformed and not the other? Is it not the Reason why any Reformation is necessary, that the Church's Purity and Safety should be preserved? And is not that as much or more endangered by erroneous Doctrines than by personal Abuses? Will not then the Parity of Reason hold proportionably for one as well as the other? That if the Church may be reformed by Parts as to lesser Abuses, then much more certainly as to greater. Besides, you say, *Gerson allowed no Schismatical Reformations against the Churches Head*: neither do we plead for any such; but then you must shew, Who the Church's Head is, and, By what Right he comes to be so; otherwise the cause of the Schism will fall upon him who pretends to be the Head to direct others, and is as corrupt a Member as any in the Body. But his Lordship

ship adds, *This right of Provincial Synods, that they might decree in Causes of Faith, and in Cases of Reformation, where Corruptions had crept into the Sacraments of Christ, was practised much above a thousand Years ago by many, both National and Provincial Synods.* For which he first instanceth in the Council at Rome under Pope Sylvester An. 324. condemning Photinus and Sabellius, whose Heresies were of a high Nature against the Faith; but here you say, *the very Title confutes his Pretence, for it was held under the Pope and therefore not against him.* But however, whether with the Pope or against him, it was no more than a Provincial Synod; and this decreed something in matters of Faith, though according to your own Doctrine the Pope could not be Infallible there: For you restrain his *Infallibility* to a General Council, and do not assert that it belongs to the particular Church of Rome. As well then may any other Provincial Synod determine matters of Faith, as that of Rome, since that hath no more Infallibility belonging to it as such than any other particular Church hath; and the Pope himself you say may err when he doth not define Matters of Faith in a General Council. To his Lordship's second Instance of the Council of Gangra about the same time condemning Eustathius for his condemning Marriage as unlawful; you answer to the same purpose, *That Osius was there, Pope Sylvester's Legate;* but what then? If the Pope had been there himself he had not been Infallible, much less certainly his Legate, who could have only a *Second-hand Infallibility.* To the third of the Council of Carthage, condemning Rebaptization about 348. you grant, *That it was assembled by Gratus Bishop of Carthage, but that no new Article was defined in it, but only the perpetual Tradition of the Church was confirmed therein.* Neither do we plead for any Power in Provincial Councils to define any new Articles of Faith, but only to revive the old, and to confirm them in opposition to any Innovations in point of Doctrine; and as to this we profess to be guided by the sense of Scripture as interpreted by the unanimous consent of the Fathers and the four first General Councils. To the fourth of the Council of Aquileia, A. D. 381. condemning Palladius and Secundinus for embracing the Arrian Heresie, St. Ambrose being present; you answer, *That they only condemned those who had been condemned already by the Nicene Council; and, St. Ambrose and other Bishops of Italy being present, Who can doubt but every thing was done there by the Pope's Authority and Consent?* But if they only enforced the Decrees of the Council of Nice, What need of the Pope's Authority to do that? And do you think that there were no Provincial Councils in that part of Italy which was particularly distinguished from the sub-bicarian Churches under the Bishop of Rome, wherein the Pope was not present either by himself or Legates? If you think so, your Thoughts have more of your Will than Understanding in them. But if this Council proceeded according to that of Nice, Will it not be as lawful for other Provincial Councils to reform particular Churches, as long as they keep to the Decrees not barely of Nice, but of the four General Councils, which the Church of England looks on as her Duty to do? In the two following Instances of the second Council of Carthage, declaring in behalf of the Trinity, and the Milevitan Council about the Pelagian Heresie; you say, *The Bishops of Rome were consulted:* But what then? Were they consulted as the Heads of the Church, or only as eminent Members of it in regard of their Faith and Piety? Prove the former when you are able, and as to the latter it depends upon the continuance of that Faith and Piety in them; and when once the reason is taken away, there can be no Necessity of continuing the same resort. The same answer will serve for what you say

P. 154.

Concil. Tolct.
4. Can. 3.

P. 168.

p. 12.

Ibid.

P. 155.
The Instituti-
on of a Chri-
stian Man.
A. 1534.
In Synodo Lon-
din. Sess. 8. die
Veneris Jan.
Ann. 1562.

concerning the second Council of Aurange, determining the Controversies about Grace and Free-will, supposing we grant it assembled by the means of Felix 4. Bishop of Rome; as likewise to the third of Toledo. We come therefore to that which you call his Lordship's reserve, and Master-Allegation, the fourth Council of Toledo; which, saith he, did not only handle Matters of Faith for the Reformation of that People, but even added also something to the Creed, which were not expressly delivered in former Creeds. Nay, the Bishops did not only practise this, to condemn Heresies in National and Provincial Synods, and so to reform those several Places and the Church it self by Parts; but they did openly challenge this as their Right and Due, and that without any leave asked of the See of Rome. For in this fourth Council of Toledo they decree, that, If there happen a cause of Faith to be settled, a General that is a National Synod of all Spain and Gallicia shall be held thereon. And this in the Year 643. where you see it was then Catholick Doctrine in all Spain, that a National Synod might be a competent Judge in a cause of Faith. But here still we meet with the same Answer, That all this might be done with a due Subordination to the See Apostolick, but that it doth not hence follow that any thing may be done in Provincial Councils against the Authority of it. Neither do we plead that any thing may be done against the just Authority of the Bishop of Rome, or any other Bishop; but then you must prove, that he had a just Authority over the Church of England, and that he exercised no Power here at the Reformation but what did of right belong to him. But the fuller debate of these Things must be left to that place where you designedly assert and vindicate the Pope's Authority.

These Things being thus in the general cleared, we come to the particular Application of them to the case of the Church of England. As to which, his Lordship says; And if this were practised so often and in so many Places, Why may not a National Council of the Church of England do the like, as she did? For she cast off the Pope's Usurpation, and as much as in her lay restored the King to his right. That appears by a Book subscribed by the Bishops in Henry the Eighth's Time. And by the Records in the Archbishops Office, orderly kept and to be seen. In the Reformation which came after, our Princes had their Parts, and the Clergy theirs. And to these two principally the Power and Direction for Reformation belongs. That our Princes had their Parts, is manifest by their calling together of the Bishops, and others of the Clergy, to consider of that which might seem worthy Reformation. And the Clergy did their part; for, being thus called together by Regal Power, they met in the National Synod of sixty two. And the Articles there agreed on were afterwards confirmed by Acts of State, and the Royal Assent. In this Synod, the Positive Truths which are delivered are more than the Polemicks. So that a meer Calumny it is, that we profess only a Negative Religion. True it is, and we must thank Rome for it, our Confession must needs contain some Negatives. For we cannot but deny that Images are to be adored. Nor can we admit maimed Sacraments. Nor grant Prayers in an unknown Tongue. And in a corrupt Time or Place, 'tis as necessary in Religion to deny Falshood, as to assert and vindicate Truth. Indeed this latter can hardly be well and sufficiently done but by the former, an Affirmative Verity being ever included in the Negative to a Falshood. As for any Error which might fall into this (as any other Reformation) if any such can be found; then I say, and 'tis most true, Reformation, especially in cases of Religion, is so difficult a Work, and subject to so many Pretensions, that 'tis almost impossible but the Reformers should step too far, or fall too short in some smaller Things or other, which in regard of the far greater Benefit coming by the Reformation it self, may well be passed over and born with.

withall. But if there have been any wilful and gross Errors, not so much in Opinion as in Fact (Sacrilege too often pretending to Reform Superstition) that's the Crime of the Reformers, not of the Reformation; and they are long since gone to God to answer it, to whom I leave them.

This is his Lordship's full and just Account of the Proceedings of the Reformation in the Church of England, to which we must consider what Answer you return. To his Lordship's Question, Why may not a National Council of the Church of England do the like? You give this Answer, *Truly I know no Reason why it may not, provided it be a true National Council and a true Church of England, (as those recited were true Churches and Councils) and provided also that it do no more.* We are contented to put the Issue of this Business upon these three Things, viz. That our Church is a true Church, That the Power which reformed it was sufficient for that purpose, and, That no more was done by them than was in their Power to do. But for the first you tell us, *That seeing by the Church of England be means the present Protestant Church there, you must crave Leave of his Lordship to deny his Supposition, and tell him the Church of England in that Sense, signifies no true Church.* Were it not an easie matter to requite you by telling you, It is impossible we should be guilty of Schism in any Separation from your Communion, because we must crave leave of you to say, that the Church of Rome is no true Church; and where there is Schism, that must be a true Church which Men are guilty of it in separating from. Not as though I sought only to return a Blow on you which I could not defend our Church from; but to let you see, that by whatever way you would prove your Church to be true, by the same we may prove ours to be so too. If you own and believe the Christian Doctrine to be the way to Salvation, so do we. If you embrace the ancient Creeds, so do we. If you acknowledge the Scriptures to be God's Word, so do we. If you join together in Participation of the Sacraments of Baptism, and the Lord's Supper, so do we. If you have a constant Succession of Bishops, so have we. Name then what it is, which is Fundamental to the Being of a Church, which our Protestant Church doth want? You grant the Church of England was a true Church before the Reformation, wherein was it altered from it self by it, that it ceased to be a true Church? Was it, in denying the Pope's Supremacy in Henry the eighth's Time? That cannot be; for you very remarkably grant afterwards, *That the Bishops, and the King too, left the Pope in Possession of all that he could rightly challenge.* (Which is a Concession we shall make more use of afterwards) Surely then this could not unchurch them. Or, Was it the Proceedings of the Reformation in Queen Elizabeth's Time? The Supremacy could not be it neither now; for that was asserted under a more moderate Title in her Time, than in her Father's. Was it the Use of the Liturgy in the English Tongue? Surely not, when Pius the Fourth offered to confirm it, as is credibly reported from Vincentius Parpalia, whom that Pope employed on a Message to Queen Elizabeth, with Terms of Accommodation. But, what was it which did unchurch us? Were they the Articles of Religion agreed on in the Convocation, 1562? If they were these, were they either the positive or negative Articles? If the positive, were they the asserting the Articles contained in the three Creeds, the Sufficiency of Scriptures, the necessity of Divine Grace? or, What else? If the negative, Was it the denying Purgatory, Invocation of Saints, Unlawfulness of Priests Marriage, Communion in one kind? or, Which of them else was it, which made the Protestant Church to be no true Church? Or, Is it lastly the asserting, *That as the Church of Jerusalem, Alexandria, and Antioch, have erred, so also the Church*

P. 168. n. 9.

Ibid.

P. 169.

Art. 19.

Church of Rome hath erred, not only in their Livings, and manner of Ceremonies, but also in Matters of Faith? Is this it which hath done us all the Mischief to unchurch us, viz. the denying your Church's Infallibility? If this be it, it is our Comfort yet, that our Church will remain a true Church, till yours be proved to be Infallible; which I dare say, will be long enough. But, as though it were in your absolute Power to Church and Unchurch whom, and when you please, you offer at no Proof at all of this Assertion, but only very fairly *crave his Lordship's leave to call the Protestant Church not a true Church*: Which indeed is a more civil way of begging the Question. And if it will not be granted, you cannot help it; for you have done your utmost, in *craving his leave* for it, and you have no more to say to it.

¶ 13.

P. 168, 169.

But, you seem to say much more to the second, *That the Reformation was not managed by a lawful Power, nor carried on in a due manner*; for you offer to prove, that the National Synod 1562, was no lawful Synod, in these Words. *For is it not notorious, that that pretended Synod, A.D. 1562. were all manifest Usurpers? Is it not manifest, that they all by Force intruded themselves, both into the Sees of other lawful Bishops, and into the Cures of other lawful Pastors, quietly and Canonically possessed of them before the said Intrusion? Can those be accounted a lawful National Council of England, or lawfully to represent the English Church, who never had any lawful, that is, Canonical and just Vocation, Mission, or Jurisdiction given them to, and over the English Nation?* Two Things you object as the great Reasons why those Persons who sate in the Convocation, A. 1562. could make no lawful Synod, and those are Intrusion, and want of a lawful Mission, which shall be particularly examined. The first Charge is of Intrusion, which you would seem to aggravate by several Circumstances, *that they intruded themselves, and that by Force*; and not some, but *all*; and that *into the Sees of other lawful Bishops, and Cures of lawful Pastors*. But how true these Circumstances are, must appear by a true Account of the Matters of Fact relating to these Things in the beginning of Queen Elizabeth's Reign. How false that is, *That all intruded themselves*, is notorious to any one who understands any thing of those Times: For this Convocation was held in the fifth Year of Queen Elizabeth. And in the first of her Reign, of 26 Cathedral Churches, there were but fourteen or fifteen Bishops then living in England. For the Sees of Salisbury and Oxford fell vacant A. 1557. and were not supplied in the time of Queen Mary. Hereford, Bristow, Bangor, were vacant by the Death of the several Bishops, some Weeks before Queen Mary. Canterbury by the death of Cardinal Pool, the same Day with the Queen. Norwich and Gloucester a few Weeks after her; and so likewise Rochester, Worcester, and S. Asaph became vacant by the voluntary Exile of Pates and Goldwell, the Bishops thereof; so that but fifteen Bishops were then living and remaining in England. And, were all those who supplied these vacant Sees, Intruders? A strange kind of Intrusion into dead Mens Places! So then, this Circumstance is notoriously false, *That they All by force intruded themselves into the Sees of other Lawful Bishops*. But let us see, Whether the other are more justly charged with a forcible Intrusion into the Sees of the other Bishops. For which we must consider what the Proceedings were in Reference to them: It appears then, that in the first Year of the Queen, the Oath of Supremacy, formed and enjoined in the time of Henry 8. was in the first Parliament of Queen Elizabeth, revived for the better securing the Queen of the Fidelity of her Subjects; but yet it was so revived, that several considerable Passages in the Act concerning it, were upon mature Deliberation mitigated, both as to the Queen's Title,

which

which was not *Supreme Head*, but *Supreme Governour*; a Title which *Queen Mary* had used before, as appears by an Act passed in the third Session of Parliament in her time: and likewise as to the penalty; for, whereas the *Stat. 28. Hen. 8. c. 10.* was so very severe, *That whosoever did extol the Authority of the Bishop of Rome, was, for the first Offence, within the compass of a Præmunire, and for refusing to take the Oath, was guilty of Treason*; it passed now in *Queen Elizabeth's* time, only with this penalty, *That such who refused it, should be excluded such Places of Honour and Profit, as they held in the Church or Common-wealth; and that such as should maintain or defend the Authority, Preheminence, Power, or Jurisdiction, Spiritual or Ecclesiastical, of any foreign Prince, Prelate, Person, State, or Potentate whatsoever, should be three times convicted before he suffered the Pains of Death.* Upon the expiring of the Parliament, Commissioners were appointed to require the Bishops to take the Oath of Supremacy, according to the Law made to that purpose, which being tendred to them, they all (*Kitchin of Landaffe* only excepted) unanimously refused it, although they had taken it before as *Priests or Bishops*, in the Reign of *Henry 8.* or *Edward 6.* But whether by some secret Intimations from *Rome*, or their own Obstinacy, they were resolved rather to undergo the Penalty of the Law, than to take it now; and accordingly before the end of that Year, they were deprived of their *Bishopricks*. So that the Question about the Intrusion of those Bishops, who came into their Sees, depends upon the Legality of the deprivation of these. And certainly, whosoever considers their former Carriage *White and Watson.* towards the *Queen*, in refusing to assist at her Coronation, and some of them threatening to excommunicate her instead of disputing at *Westminster*, as they had solemnly engaged to do, joyned with this Contumacy in refusing the Oath, will find that these Persons did not unjustly suffer this deprivation. For which I need not run out into the *Princes* Power over Ecclesiastical Persons; for you have given a sufficient Reason for it your self in that Acknowledgment of yours, *That the Bishops, and the King too,* (meaning *King Henry*) *left the Pope in possession of all he could rightly challenge.* If this be true, that notwithstanding the *Stat. 28. Hen. 8.* notwithstanding the Oath of Supremacy then taken, the Pope might enjoy all that belonged to him of *Divine Right*, he might then do the same, notwithstanding this Oath in *Queen Elizabeth's* time, which was only reviving the former with some mitigation; and what could it be then else but Obstinacy and Contumacy in them to refuse it? And therefore the Plea which you make for those whom you call the *Henry-Bishops*, will sufficiently condemn these present Bishops, whom we now speak of. For if those Bishops only renounced the *Popes Canonical and acquired Jurisdiction here in England*, as you say, *i. e. That Authority and Jurisdiction in Ecclesiastical Matters, which the Pope exercised here by virtue of the Canons, Prescription, and other Titles of humane right, and gave it to the King; yet they never renounced or deprived him of that part of his Authority, which is far more intrinsecal to his Office, and of Divine Right; they never denied the Popes Sovereign Power to teach the Universal Church, and determine all Controversies of Faith whatsoever in a General Council.* If these things, I say, be true, which you confidently assert, the more inexcusable were these Bishops for refusing that Oath of Supremacy which they had not only taken in *King Henry's* time, but which, by your own Confession, takes away nothing of the *Pope's Authority, in relation to the whole Catholick Church.* And by this means their Obstinacy appeared so great, as might justly deserve a deprivation. It being certainly in the Power of the *King and Bishops* to assert their own rights,

in Opposition to any Canons or Prescriptions whatsoever of merely humane Right. So that by your own Confession, the more excusable the *Henry-Bishops* were, as you call them, the less excusable the *Mary-Bishops* were (as, to follow you, we must call them) in refusing the Oath of Supremacy, when tendred to them. Was it lawful then in King *Henry's* time, to take this Oath or not? If not, then King *Henry's* Bishops are infinitely to blame for taking it, and you for defending them: If it was lawful then, why not in Queen *Elizabeth's* Time? Had she not as much Reason to impose it as her Father? Had she not as much Power to do it? When one of the chief Refusers, *Heath*, Arch-Bishop of *Tork*, and then Lord Chancellor of *England*, did, upon the first Notice of the Death of Queen *Mary*, declare to the House of Commons, *That the Succession of the Crown did of Right belong to the Princess Elizabeth, whose Title they conceived to be free from all legal Questions*; this could be then no Plea at all for them. So that if any Persons through the greatest Obstinacy, might be deprived by a Prince of their Ecclesiastical Preferments, these might; and when you can prove, that in no case a Prince hath Power to deprive Ecclesiastical Persons, you will say more to your purpose than yet you have done. But till you have done that, it remains clear, that these Bishops were justly deprived; and if so, What was to be done with their vacant Sees? Must they be kept vacant still? Or such be put into them who were guilty of the same Fault with themselves, in refusing the Oath, when tendred to them? If not such, then it was necessary that other fit Persons should be legally consecrated and invested in them: And so they were, the Places being supplied by Worthy Persons; the Arch-bishop of *Canterbury* being consecrated by a Canonical Number of *Edward-Bishops*, and the rest duly consecrated by other Hands. And for all this, *Must all these Persons be Intruders, and intrude themselves by force, and that into the Places of other lawful Bishops*? When so many Sees were actually vacant, and the rest by due form of Law, into which other Bishops were elected, and legally consecrated, notwithstanding the putid Fable of the *Nags-Head* Ordination, which hath so often and so evidently been disproved, that I am glad to find you have so much Modesty, as not to mention it. These Bishops being thus legally invested in their Places, To whom did the Care and Government of the *English* Church belong? To these, or to those who were justly deprived? If to these, Were not they then the due Representatives of the *English* Church in a National Synod, who with those of the lower House of Convocation, make up a true National Council? And if so, it belonged to them as such, to consider what appertained to the Faith and Government of the Church of *England*. For they undertook not to prescribe to the whole World, that they leave to the Bishop and Church of *Rome* (not as legally belonging to them, but arrogantly usurped by them) but to draw up *Articles of Religion*, which should be owned by all such who enjoyed any Place of Trust in the Church of *England*. So that in all this they were neither Intruders, neither did they act any thing beyond their Place and Authority. But you would seem to quarrel with their *Vocation, Mission, and Jurisdiction, as though it were not lawful, i. e. Canonical and Just*; all these are your own Words, and they are but Words; for not one Syllable like a Proof is suggested. I tell you then (not to spend Time in a needless Vindication of the Vocation of the Bishops and Pastors of the Church of *England*, when you give us no Reason to question it) that by the same Arguments that you can prove that you have any lawful Bishops and Pastors in your Church, it will appear that

we

we have too. And that our Vocation and Mission is far more consonant to the *Apostolical and Primitive Church* than yours is.

But, the main Quarrel is still behind, which is, that *Supposing they had been true Bishops, and Pastors of the English Church, and their Assembly a lawful National Council*, yet, you say, *They were so far from doing the like (that other Provincial Councils had done) that they acted directly contrary to them, which Charge lies in these Things.* 1. *Condemning Points of Faith that had been generally believed and practised in the Church before them.* This you know we deny, and you barely affirm it, and I have shewed some Reason of our denial already, and shall do more when we come to Particulars. 2. *In contradicting the Doctrine of the Roman Church*: A great Heresie indeed, but never yet condemned in any *General Council*. 3. *In convening against the Express Will of the Church of Rome*: We shall then think that a Fault, when you prove it belongs to that only, to summon all Councils, *General, National, and Provincial*. 4. *In denying the Pope's Authority, or attempting to deprive him of it*: if you speak of his usurped Authority you must prove it a Fault to deprive him of it, *i. e.* to withdraw our selves from Obedience to it, for that is all the Deprivation can be here understood. If you mean *Just Authority* shew wherein it lies, whence he had it, by what means he came into it in the *Church of England*; and if you can make it appear that he had a just Claim, it will be easie proving them guilty of a Fault who disowned it. But, Whether it were a *Fault* in them or no, I am sure it is *one* in you, to lay such Things, and so many to our *Charge*, and not offering to give Evidence for one of them. But I must consider the *Infallibility* of your *Church* lies in *dictating*, and not *proving*. Thus then, for any thing which you so much as seem to say to the contrary, the Proceedings of the *Reformation* were very regular and just, being built on sufficient Grounds, managed in a legal manner, and carried on with due Moderation, which are the highest Commendations can be given to a Work of *Reformation*; and do with the greatest Right belong to the *Church of England*, of any *Church* in the Christian World. There remains nothing now, which you object against our *Reformation*, but some Faults of the *Reformers*; as to which his Lordship had already said, *If any such be found, they are the Crimes of the Persons, and not of the Reformation, and they are long since gone to God to answer it, to whom I leave them.* Which Answer so full of Justice and Modesty, one would have thought, should have been sufficient for any reasonable Man; but you are not satisfied with it. For you will have those *Faults* to come from the *Principles* of the *Reformation*, and that they did not belong to the *Persons* of the *Reformers*, but are entailed on their *Successors*. But a short Answer will suffice for both these: Shew us, What avowed Principles of the *Church of England* tend to any real *Sacrilege*, before you charge any thing of that Nature, as flowing from the *Maxims* of the *Reformation*. And if you can prove the *Successors* of the *Reformers* to continue in any *Sacrilegious Actions*, let those plead for them who will, I shall not; but leave them, as his Lordship did, *to answer such Things to God.*

As to the *Memorandum*, which his Lordship concludes this Discourse with, *That he spake at that Time of the General Church, as it was for the most part forced under the Government of the Roman See, not doubting, but that as the Universal Catholick Church would have reformed her self; had she been in all Parts freed of the Roman Toke; so, while she was for the most in these Western Parts under that Toke, the Church of Rome was, if not the only, yet the chief Hinderance of Reformation*: You answer with some Stomach; By what Force I pray? Is it possible? or, Can it enter into the Judgment of any reasonable

B b b

Man,

d. 14.
P. 196.

P. 170.

P. 156. n. 6.

Man, that a single Bishop, of no very large Diocese, should be able by force, to bring into Subjection so many large Provinces of Christendom, as confessedly did acknowledge the Pope's Power, when the pretended Reformation began? But, what reasonable Man can imagine, that a single Bishop, indeed of no very large Diocese (if kept within his Bounds) should, in Progress of Time, extend his Power so far as the Pope did, but by one of these two Means, Force, or Fraud? And since you seem to be so much displeased at the former, I pray take the latter; or rather, the Conjunction of both together. For that there was Force used, appears by the manifold Resistance which was made to the Encroachments of the Pope's Power; and the sad Complaints of the Usurpations and Abuses which were in it; and these abundantly delivered by Classical Authors of both the present and precedent Times: and (to use more of your own Words) all Ecclesiastical Monuments are full of them; so that this is no false Calumny, or bitter Pasquil (as you call it) but a very plain and evident Truth. But that there was likewise a great deal of Art, Subilty and Fraud used in the getting, keeping, and managing the Pope's Power, he hath but a small Measure of Wit who doth not understand, and they as little of Honesty, who dare not confess it.

B

C H A P. V.

84. 2. D

Of the Roman Churches Authority.

The Question concerning the Church of Rome's Authority entred upon. How far our Church, in reforming her self, condemns the Church of Rome. The Pope's Equality with other Patriarchs, asserted. The Arabick Canons of the Nicene Council proved to be Supposititious. The Polity of the Ancient Church discovered from the sixth Canon of the Council of Nice. The Rights of Primates and Metropolitans settled by it. The suitableness of the Ecclesiastical to the Civil Government. That the Bishop of Rome had then a limited Jurisdiction within the Suburbicary Churches; as Primate of the Roman Diocese. Of the Cyprian Privilege; that it was not peculiar, but common to all Primates of Dioceses. Of the Pope's Primacy according to the Canons; how far pertinent to our Dispute. How far the Pope's Confirmation requisite to new elected Patriarchs. Of the Synodical and Communicatory Letters. The Testimonies of Petrus de Marcâ concerning the Pope's Power of confirming and deposing Bishops. The Instances brought for it, considered. The case of Athanasius being restored by Julius, truly stated. The Proceedings of Constantine in the case of the Donatists cleared, and the Evidence thence against the Pope's Supremacy. Of the Appeals of Bishops to Rome, how far allowed by the Canons of the Church. The great Case of Appeals between the Roman and African Bishops discussed. That the Appeals of Bishops were prohibited, as well as those of the inferiour Clergy. T. C.'s Fraud in citing the Epistle of the African Bishops, for acknowledging Appeals to Rome. The contrary manifested from the same Epistle to Boniface, and the other to Coelestine. The Exemption of the Ancient Britanick Church from any Subjection to the See of Rome, asserted. The case of Wilfrid's Appeal answered. The Primacy of England not derived from Gregory's Grant to Augustin the Monk. The Ancient Primacy of the Britanick Church not lost upon the Saxon Conversion. Of the State of the African Churches, after their denying Appeals to Rome. The rise of the Pope's Greatness under Christian

Christian Emperors. Of the Decree of the Sardican Synod, in case of Appeals: Whether ever received by the Church: No Evidence thence of the Pope's Supremacy. Zosimus his Forgery in sending the Sardican Canons instead of the Nicene. The weakness of the Pleas for it, manifested.

THAT which now remains to be discussed in the *Question of Schism*, is, concerning the Authority of the Church and Bishop of Rome, Whether that be so large and extensive, as to bind us to an universal Submission, so that by renouncing of it, we violate the *Unity* of the Church, and are thereby guilty of *Schism*? But, before we come to a particular Discussion of that, we must cast our Eyes back on the precedent Chapter, in which the Title promiseth us, *That Protestants should be further convinced of Schism*; but upon Examination of it, there appears not so much as the Shadow of any new Matter, but it wholly depends upon Principles already refuted, and so contains a bare Repetition of what hath been abundantly answered in the first Part. So your first Section hath no more of Strength, than what lies in your Churches *Infallibility*: For, when you would plead, *That though the Church of Rome be the accused Party, yet she may judge in her own cause*; you do it upon this ground, *That you had already proved the Roman Church to be infallible, and therefore your Church might as well condemn her Accusers, as the Apostles theirs; and that Protestants not pretending Infallibility, cannot rationally be permitted to be Accusers and Witnesses against the Roman Church.* Now, what doth all this come to, in case your Church be not infallible, as we have evidently proved she is not, in the first part; and that she is so far from it, that she hath most grossly erred, as we shall prove in the third Part? Your second Section supposes the Matter of Fact evident, *That Protestants did contradict the publick Doctrine and Belief of all Christians generally throughout the World*, which we have lately proved to be an egregious Falsity, and shall do more afterwards. The cause of the *Separatists*, and the Church of *England*, is vastly different, Whether we look on the Authority, Cause, or Manner of their Proceedings; and in your other Instances you still beg the Question, *That your Church is our Mother-Church, and therefore we are bound to submit to her Judgment, though she be the accused Party.* But as this whole Business of *Quo Judice*, nothing can be spoken with more Solidity and Satisfaction, than what his Lordship saith. *If it be a Cause common to both, as certain it is here (between the Protestant and Roman Church) then neither Part alone may be Judge; if neither alone may judge then either they must be judged by a third, which stands indifferent to both, and that is the Scripture; or if there be a Jealousie, or a Doubt of the Sense of the Scripture, they must either both repair to the Exposition of the Primitive Church, and submit to that; or both call and submit to a General Council, which shall be lawfully called, and fairly and freely held with Indifferency to all Parties; and that must judge the Difference according to Scripture, which must be their Rule as well as private Mens.* When you either attempt to shew the unreasonableness of this, or substitute any thing more reasonable instead of it, you may expect a further Answer to the Question, *Quo Judice*? as far as it concerns the difference between your Church, and ours. The Remainder of this whole Chapter, is only a Repetition of somewhat concerning *Fundamentals*, and a further expatiating in Words, without the Addition of any more Strength from Reason or Authority upon the Churches *Infallibility* being proved from Scripture; which having been thoroughly considered already, and an account given, not only of the meaning of those Places (one excepted, which we shall meet with again) but of the Reason, Why the Sense of them as to *Infallibility*,

p. 1.

Chap. 14.

P. 171. 172.

P. 173.

P. 157.

ad p. 181.

Infallibility should be restrained to the Apostles, I find no sufficient Motive inducing me to follow you, in distrusting the Reader's Memory, and trespassing on his Patience, so much as to inculcate the same things over and over, as you do. Passing by therefore the Things already handled, and leaving the rest (if any such Thing appear) to a more convenient Place, where these very Places of Scripture are again brought upon the Stage in the Questions of the Pope's Authority and Infallibility of General Councils, I come to your following Chapter, in which you enter upon the Vindication of the *Roman Churches Authority*.

¶ 2.

2. That which his Lordship hath long insisted on, and evidently proved, is, *The Right which particular Churches have to reform themselves, when the General Church cannot for Impediments, or will not for Negligence do it.* And your Answers to his Proofs have had their Weakness sufficiently laid open; the only thing here objected further, is, *Whether in so doing particular Churches do not condemn others of Errors in Faith?* To which his

F. 166.

Lordship answers, *That to reform themselves, and to condemn others, are two different Works, unless it fall out so, that by reforming themselves, they do by Consequence condemn any other, that is guilty in that Point, in which they reform themselves; and so far to judge and condemn others, is not only lawfull but necessary.* A Man that lives Religiously, doth not by and by sit in Judgment, and condemn with his Mouth all prophane Livers; but yet while he is silent, his very Life condemns them. To what end his Lordship produceth this Instance, any one may easily understand; but you abuse it, as though his Lordship had said, *That Protestants only by their Religious Lives do condemn your Church;* and upon this run out into a strange Declamation about

P. 182. n. 1.

Who the Men are that live so Religiously? They who to propagate the Gospel the better, marry Wives contrary to the Canons, and bring Scripture for it? Yes surely, much more than they who to propagate your Church, enjoy Concubines; for which if they can bring some Canons of your Church, I am sure they can bring Scripture for it. They who pull down Monasteries both of Religious Men and Women? I see, you are still as loth to part them, as they are to be parted themselves; but if all their Lives be no more Religious than the most of them have been; the pulling of them down might be a greater act of Religion than living in them. They who cast Altars to the Ground? More certainly than they who worshipped them. They who partly banish Priests, and partly put them to Death? Or they who commit Treasons and do Things worthy of Death? But you are doubtless very Religious and tender-hearted Men, whose Consciences would never suffer you to banish or put any to Death for the sake of Religion; no not in Queen Maries time here in England! They who deface the very Tombs of Saints, and will not permit them to rest even when they are dead? Or they who profess to Worship dead Saints, and martyr living Ones with Fire and Faggot? If this be your Religious Living, none who know what Religion means will be much taken with it. I shall easily grant that you stick close to the Pope, but are therein far enough from the Doctrine or Life of S. Peter. If any of you have endured Sequesterations, Imprisonments, Death it self, I am sure it was not for any good you did; not for the Catholick Faith, but if you will, for some Catholick Treasons, such as would have enwrapt a whole Nation in Misery. If this be your suffering Persecution for Righteousness sake, you will have little Cause to rejoice in your Fellow-Sufferers. But if you had not a mind to calumniate us, and provoke us to speak sad Truths of you, all this might have been spared; for his Lordship only chose this Instance, to shew that a Church or Person may be condemned consequentially, which was not intentionally. But

you

you say, *Our Church hath formally condemned yours, by publick and solemn Censures in the 39 Articles.* Doth his Lordship deny that our Church in order to our own Reformation hath condemned many Things which your Church holds? No, but that our Church's main Intention was to reform it self; but, considering the Corruption and Degeneracy of your Church, she could not do it, without consequentially condemning yours: and, that she did justly in so doing, we are ready on all Occasions to justify.

But his Lordship asks, *If one particular Church may not judge or condemn another, What must then be done where Particulars need Reformation?* To which his Adversary gives a plain Answer, *That particular Churches must in that Case (as Irenæus intimateth) have recourse to the Church of Rome, which hath more powerful Principality; and to her Bishop, who is the chief Pastor of the whole Church, as being S. Peter's Successor, &c.* This is the rise and occasion of the present Controversie. To this his Lordship Answers, *That it is most true indeed; the Church of Rome hath had, and hath yet, more powerful Principality, than any other particular Church. But she hath not this power from Christ. The Roman Patriarch by Ecclesiastical Constitutions might perhaps have a Primacy of Order: but for Principality of Power, the Patriarchs were as even, as equal, as the Apostles were before them. The Truth is, this more powerful Principality the Roman Bishops got under the Emperours, after they became Christian; and they used the Matter so, that they grew big enough to oppose, nay, to depose the Emperours, by the same power which they had given them. And after this, other particular Churches, especially here in the West, submitted themselves to them for Succour and Protections sake. And this was one main cause that swell'd Rome into this more powerful Principality, and not any right given by Christ to make that Prelate, Pastor of the whole Church.* To this you Answer, *That to say that the Roman Churches Principality is not from Christ, is contrary to St. Austin and the whole Milevitan Council, who in their Epistle to Innocent the first, profess that the Popes Authority is grounded upon Scripture, and consequently proceeds from Christ.* But whoever seriously reads and thoroughly considers that Epistle, will find no such thing as that you aim at there. For the scope of the Epistle is to perswade Pope Innocent to appear against *Cælestius* and *Pelagius*; to that end they give first an Account of their Doctrine, shewing how pernicious and contrary to Scripture it was; after which they tell him that *Pelagius* being at *Jerusalem* was like to do a great deal of Mischief there, but that many of the Brethren opposed him, and especially *St. Hierom.* But we, say they, do suppose that through the Mercy of our Lord Christ assisting you, those which hold such perverse and pernicious Principles may more easily yield by your Authority drawn out of Scripture. Where they do not in the least dream of his Authority as Universal Pastor being grounded on Scripture. but of his appearing against the *Pelagians* with his Authority drawn out of Scripture, that is, to that Authority which he had in the Church, by the Reputation of the Roman See, the Authority of the Scripture being added, which was so clear against the *Pelagians*, or both these going together were the most probable way to suppress their Doctrine. And it hath been sufficiently proved by others, by very many Instances of the Writers about that Age, that *Authoritas* was no more than *Rescriptum*; as particularly appears by many Passages in *Leo's* Epistles, in which sense no more is expessed by this, than that by the Pope's Answer to the Council drawn out of the Authority of Scripture, the *Pelagians* might more probably be suppressed. But what is this

S. 3.
P. 167.

P. 183.

Arbitramur — adjuvante misericordia Domini nostri Jesu Christi — Authoritati Sanctitatis tue de sanctarum Scripturarum Autoritate de promptis facilius eos qui tam perversa & perniciose sentiunt, esse cessuros.
Aug. ep 92.

to an Universal Pastorship given by Christ to him; any otherwise than to those who sat in any other Apostolical Sees?

But your great Quarrel is against his Lordship, for making all the Patriarchs even and equal, as to *Principality of Power*: and when he saith, *Equal as the Apostles were*, you say, *that is equivocal*; for though the Apostles had equal Jurisdiction over the whole Church, yet St. Peter alone had Jurisdiction over the Apostles; but this is neither proved from John 21. nor is it at all clear in Antiquity as will appear when we come to that Subject.

¶ 4.

P. 184.

But this Assertion of the *Equality of Patriarchs*, is so destructive to your Pretensions in behalf of the Church of Rome, that you set your self more particularly to disprove it, which you offer to do by two Things. 1. By a Canon of the Nicene Council. 2. By the Practice of the ancient Church. You begin with the first of them, and tell us, *That 'tis contrary to the Council of Nice, in the third Canon whereof, which concerns the Jurisdiction of Patriarchs, the Authority (or Principality if you will) of the Bishop of Rome is made the Pattern, and Model of that Authority and Jurisdiction which Patriarchs were to exercise over the Provincial Bishops. The Words of the Canon are these. Sicque præest Patriarcha iis omnibus, qui sub ejus potestate sunt, sicut ille qui tenet sedem Romæ, caput est & princeps omnium Patriarcharum, The Patriarch (say they) is in the same manner over all those that are under his Authority, as he who holds the See of Rome is Head and Prince of the Patriarchs. And in the same Canon the Pope is afterwards styled, Petro similis & Autoritate par, resembling St. Peter and his equal in Authority.* These are big Words indeed, and to your Purpose, if ever any such thing had been decreed by the Council of Nice; but I shall evidently prove, that this Canon is *Supposititious*, and a notorious piece of *Forgery*. Which Forgery is much increased by you when you tell us, these Words are contained in the third Canon of the Council of Nice: Which in the Greek Editions of the Canons by *du Tillet*, and the *Codex Canonum* by *Justellus*, and all other extant, in the Latin Versions of *Dionysius Exiguus*, and *Isidore Mercator*, is wholly against the *οὐνοκρατορ*, i. e. such kind of *Women* which Clergymen took into their Houses, neither as *Wives* or *Concubines*, but under a Pretext of *Piety*. In the Arabick Edition of the Nicene Canons, set out by *Alphonfus Pisanus*, the third Canon is against the Ordination either of *Neophyti* or *Criminal Persons*, and so likewise in that of *Turrianus*. So that in no Edition, whether Arabick or other, is this the third Canon of the Council of Nice, and therefore you were guilty either of great Ignorance and Negligence in saying so, or of notorious Fraud and Imposture, if you knew it to be otherwise, and yet said it that the unwary Reader might believe this Canon to be within the 20. which are the only genuine Canons of the Council of Nice. Indeed such a Canon there is in these Arabick Editions, but it is so far from being the third, that in the Editions both of *Pisanus* and *Turrianus* it is the *thirtyninth*, and in it I grant those Words are; but yet you will have little Reason to rejoice in them, when I have proved, (as I doubt not to do) that this whole *farrago* of Arabick Canons is a meer Forgery; and that I shall prove both from the true Number of the Nicene Canons, and the Incongruity of many Things in the Arabick Canons with the State and Polity of the Church at that time.

In those Editions set out by *Pisanus* and *Turrianus*, from the Copy which they say was brought by *Baptista Romanus* from the Patriarch of Alexandria there are no fewer than *eighty Canons*; whereas the Nicene Council never passed above 20. Which if it appear true, that will sufficiently discover the Forgery and *Supposititiousness* of these Arabick Canons. Now that there

there were no more than twenty genuine *Canons* of the *Council of Nice*. I thus prove, first from *Theodoret*, who after he had given an account of the Proceedings in the *Council* against the *Arrians*, he saith, *That the Fathers met in Council again, and passed twenty Canons relating to the Churches Polity*; and *Gelasius Cyzicenus*, whom *Alphonsus Pisanus* set forth with his *Latin Version*, recounts no more than *twenty Canons*; the same Number is asserted by *Nicephorus Callistus*; and we need not trouble our selves with reciting the Testimonies of more *Greek Authors*, since *Binius* himself confesseth, that all the *Greeks* say, there were no more than *twenty Canons* then determined. But although certainly the *Greeks* were the most competent Judges in this case, yet the *Latins* themselves did not allow of more. For although *Ruffinus* makes twenty two, yet that is not by the Addition of any more *Canons*, but by splitting two into four. And if we believe *Pope Stephen* in *Gratian*, the *Roman Church* did allow of no more than twenty. And in that *Epitome* of the *Canons* which *Pope Hadrian* sent to *Charles the Great* for the Government of the *Western Churches*, A. D. 773. the same Number of the *Nicene Canons* appear still. And in a *MS.* of *Hincmarus Rhemenfis*, against *Hincmarus Laudunensis*, this is not only asserted, but at large contended for, that there were no more *Canons* determined at *Nice*, than those twenty which we now have, from the Testimonies of the *Tripartite History*, *Ruffinus*, the *Carthaginian Council*, the *Epistles of Cyril of Alexandria*, and *Atticus of Constantinople*, and the twelfth Action of the *Council of Chalcedon*. So that if both *Greeks* and *Latins* say true, there could be no more than twenty genuine *Canons* of the *Council of Nice*; which may be yet further proved by two Things, viz. the Proceedings of the *African Fathers* in the case of *Zosimus* about the *Nicene Canons* and the *Codex Canonum Ecclesiae Universae*, both which yield an abundant Testimony to our Purpose. If ever there was a just Occasion given for an early and exact Search into the Authentick *Canons* of the *Council of Nice*, it was certainly in that grand Debate between the *African Fathers* and the *Roman Bishops* in the case of *Appeals*. For *Zosimus* challenging not only a right of Appeals to himself, but a Power of dispatching *Legates* unto the *African Churches* to hear Causes there, and all this by virtue of a *Canon* in the *Nicene Council*, and this being delivered to them in *Council* by *Faustinus*, *Philippus*, and *Asellus*, whom *Zosimus* sent into *Africa*, to negotiate this Affair; no sooner did they hear this, but they were startled and amazed at it, that such a Thing should be challenged by virtue of a *Canon* in the *Council of Nice*, which they had never heard of before. Upon this they declare themselves willing to yield to what should appear to be determined by the *Nicene Canons*; thence they propound that a more exact Search might be made into the authentical Copies of them; for they profess no such thing at all to appear, in all the *Greek Copies* which they had among them; although *Cæcilianus* the *Bishop of Carthage* were present in the *Council of Nice*, and brought home those Copies which were preserved in the *Church of Africa*. For in all the *Subscriptions* of the *Nicene Council*, whether *Arabick* or others, the Name of *Cæcilian* appears; now *Cæcilian* was immediate Predecessor in *Carthage* to *Aurelius*, who presided in that *Council* wherein

Αὐτὸς δὲ συνεδρῶντες εἰς τὸ συνέδριον, περὶ τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς πολιτείας νόμους ἔγραψαν εἰκοσι. Theodoret. hist. Eccles. l. 1. c. 7. ed. Sirmond. 1642.

Ἐξέθετο δὲ καὶ ἐκκλησιαστικὸς κανὼν ἐκ κοινῆς ἐκ τῆς Νικαίας. Gelas. Acta. Concil. Nicen. lib. 2.

Τὸ τελευτάειον δὲ ἱερέως ἐκτίθεται εἰκοσι ἕξ κανόνες εἰσὶν ἐξ ὧν ὁμοῦ. Niceph. Ecclesiast. hist. l. 8. c. 19.

Quamquam Græci omnes afferant et tueantur, Nicæni Concilii Canones viginti tantum fuisse, &c. Bin. not. in Concil. Nicæn. p. 366. To. 1. Ruffin. Ecclesiast. hist. lib. 1. cap. 5.

Viginti tantum capitula Nicæne Synodi in Sanctâ Romanâ Ecclesiâ haberi. Gratian. distinct. 16. c. 20.

Deinde etiam 20. capitulis Nicæni Concilii recitatis, communi decreto statuerunt capitula 37. (sive 39.) quæ subsequuntur. Vid. Justell. not. in Cod. Eccles. African. p. 14.

Quod non nisi viginti capitula quæ habemus in Nicæno Concilio fuerunt constituta. c. 21. apud Justell. ibid.

Codex. Can.
Eccles. Afric.
p. 58.

Codex Canon.
p. 363.

Id. p. 360.
Turrian. pref.
in Canon. Arab.

Consultatio de Controvers. inter Paul. 5.
Et rempub. Vener. apud Goldast. Mo-
narch. Rom. 3. p. 444.

wherein these Things were debated. And there it is expressly said, There were but twenty *Canons*. But in order to further Satisfaction, they decree that a Message should be sent on purpose to *Constantinople*, *Antioch*, and *Alexandria*, to find out the Authentick Copies of the *Nicene Canons*, and after a most diligent Search no more *Canons* could be found than what the *African Fathers* had before. And thence in the Epistle of *Anticas* of *Constantinople*, written to the *Council* of *Carthage*, he acquaints them, that he, according to their desire, had sent them the true and compleat *Canons* (ἐν ὁλοκληρῳ) of the *Nicene Council*. And to the same purpose *Cyril* the *Patriarch* of *Alexandria*, mentioning their Desires of having ἀληθέστατα ἴσα the most true and authentick Copies out of the *Archives* of that Church, so he tells them he had sent (τὰ πισότατα ἴσα τὰ τῆς ἀβελικῆς συνόδου τῆς ἐν τῇ Νικαίᾳ πόλει) the most faithful Copies of the Authentick Synod of *Nice*. Now if there had been any ground in the World for *Turrianus* his Conjecture, that the *Nicene Canons* were translated into *Arabick* by *Alexander*, who was present at the *Council*, for the Benefit of those in *Pentapolis*, or *Ægypt*, who only understood that Language (and that before the *Nicene Canons* were burnt, of which *Athanasius* complains); who was more likely to have found out these *Arabick Canons*, than *Cyril* the *Patriarch* of *Alexandria*, upon this occasion especially, when the full and authentick Copies were so extreemly desired? And since no such thing at all appeared then, upon the most diligent Inquiry, What can be more evident, than that these eighty *Arabick Canons* are the Imposture of some latter Age? Besides, if these *Canons* had been genuine and authentick, what imaginable Reason can be given why they were not inserted in the *Codex Canonum*, as the other twenty were? For, as *Jacobus Leschassierius* well observes, we are not to imagine that the *Ancient Church* was govern-

ed at *Randome* by loose and dispersed *Canons*, whereby it had been an easie Matter to have foisted in false and supposititious *Canons*; but that there was a certain Body and Collection of them digested into an exact Order; so that none could add to or take away any thing from it; and whatever *Canons* were not contained in this Body, had no Power or Force at all in the Church. And that there was such a *Codex Canonum*, that learned Person hath abundantly proved from the *Council* of *Chalcedon*, which hath many Passages referring to it; so that there is now no Question made, but that which *Iustellus* published, is the true Collection of those *Canons* of the *Universal Church* which were inserted into the *Codex*; in which we find but only the twenty *Canons* of the *Nicene Council*; and that there could possibly be no more, appears by the Number of the *Canons*, as they are reckoned in the *Council* of *Chalcedon*. From whence it follows, that only these twenty *Canons* were ever own'd by the *Universal Church*; for had the *Fathers* of the Church known of so many other *Canons* of the *Nicene Council*, (as surely at least the *Patriarchs* of *Alexandria* could not be ignorant of them, if there had been any such) can we possibly think that those who had so great a Veneration for the *Nicene Council*, should have left the far greater part of the *Canons* of it, out of the Code of the Churches *Canons*? I am not ignorant of what is objected by *Binius*, *Bellarmino*, and others, to prove that there were more than twenty *Canons* of the *Council* of *Nice*; but those Proofs either depend upon Things as supposititious as the *Arabick Canons* themselves, such as the Epistles of *Julius* and *Athanasius ad Marcum*; or else they only prove, that several other Things were determined by the *Nicene Council*, as concerning the Celebration of *Easter*, rebaptizing *Hereticks*, and such like, which might be by the Acts of the Council

Council without putting them into the *Canons*, as *Baronius* confesseth; but there cannot be any Evidence brought of any *Canon* which concerned the *Churches Polity* (for about that *Theodoret* and *Nicephorus* tell us the *Canons* were made) which was not among these twenty. So that it appears that these *Arabick Canons* are a meer Forgery of later Times, there being no Evidence at all that they were known to the *Church* in all the time of the four *General Councils*: and therefore *Baronius*, (notwithstanding the Pretences of *Pisanus* and *Turrianus* from the *Alexandrian Copy*, and that out of *Marcellus* his *Library*, yet) since these *Canons* were unknown in the Controversie of the *African Church* about the *Nicene Canons*, leaves the *Patronage* of them to such as might be able to defend them. And *Spondanus* in his *Contraction* of him, (though in his *Marginal Note* he saith, *Baronius* was sometimes more inclinable to the enlarged Number of the *Nicene Canons*) yet he relates it as his positive Opinion, that he rejected all but the twenty, whether *Arabick* or other, as spurious and supposititious. You see then what a fair Choice you have made of the third *Canon* of the *Council of Nice* to prove the Superiority of the *Pope* over other *Patriarchs* by; when neither is it the third *Canon*, nor any *Canon* at all of the *Council of Nice*, but a spurious Figment, like those of *Isidore Mercator*, who thought all would pass for gold which made for the Interest of the *Church of Rome*.

But were there not such a strong and pregnant Evidence from Authority to make it appear that these *Canons* were supposititious, yet the Incongruity of them, with the state of the *Church* at that time would abundantly manifest it, if we had time to compare many of those *Canons* with it. But that which is most material to our Purpose, concerning the Equality of the *Patriarchs*, your following Words will put us upon a further Enquiry into. This also, say you (viz. That the *Pope* was Head and Prince of all the *Patriarchs*) the practice of the *Church* shews, which is always the best *Expositor* and *Assertor* of the *Canons*. For not only the *Pope's Confirmation* was required to all new elected *Patriarchs*, but it belonged likewise to him to depose unworthy ones, and restore the unjustly deposed by others. We read of no less than eight several *Patriarchs* of *Constantinople* deposed by the *Bishop of Rome*. *Sixtus* the third deposed also *Polycronius Bishop of Hierusalem*, as his *Acts* set down in the first *Tome* of the *Councils* testifie. On the contrary, *Athanasius Patriarch of Alexandria*, and *Paulus Bishop of Constantinople*, were by *Julius* the first restored to their respective *Sees*, having been unjustly expelled by *Hereticks*. The same might be said of divers others, over whom the *Pope* did exercise the like Authority; which he could never have done, upon any other ground, than that of *Divine Right*, and as being generally acknowledged *St. Peter's Successor* in the Government of the whole *Church*. Three Things I shall return you in Answer to this Discourte. 1. That the Practice of the *Church* doth not shew any such Inequality as you contend for between the *Pope* and other *Patriarchs*. 2. That no such Practice of the *Church* can be proved from the Instances by you brought; And therefore, lastly, It by no means follows that the *Pope* exercised any such Authority by *Divine Right*, or was acknowledged to be *St. Peter's Successor* in the Government of the whole *Church*. I begin with the Practice of the ancient *Church*, which is so far from being an Evidence of such an Inequality of *Patriarchs* as that you contend for, that nothing doth more confirm that which his Lordship saith concerning the Equality of them than that doth. For which we appeal to

C c c

that

Quoniam hæc ignorasse maiores visi sunt, quando oborta controversia in Ecclesia Africana, de iis mentio necessaria incubuisse; hæc libentius aliis differenda relinquimus. Baron. ad An. 325. Parag. 108.

Quamobrem quod in Epistola quadam Marci nomine 70. recensentur. — quodq; Turrianus proficitur 80. inventos Arabicâ lingua scriptos, Latinitate se donasse — quoniam hæc omnia scripta quibus ingens ille numerus Canonum stabilitur, prorsus incerta vel potius nullius sunt fidei; nec aliquis unquam probatus antiquitatis auctor amplius quam 20. Canones Nicene Synodi agnovisse reperitur, ceteros ab aliis assertos libentius rejicimus. Spondan. Epitom. Baron. ad A. 325 n. 42.

p. 5.

P. 184.

Nicol. Pap. ep.
ad Michael.
Imperat.

Sozom. l. 3. c. 7.

Τὰ ἀρχαῖα ἔθνη κατέλιπε τὰ ἐν Ἀιγύπτῳ καὶ Λιβύῃ καὶ Πενταπόλει, ὥστε τὴν ἐν Ἀλεξάνδρειᾳ ἐπισκοπὴν πάντων τῶν ἐχόντων τὴν ἐξουσίαν ἐπειδὴ καὶ τὴν ἐν τῇ Ῥώμῃ ἐπισκοπὴν τὰ ἴσα συνήθε' ἐστὶν ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ κατὰ τὴν Ἀντιόχειαν καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἄλλαις ἐπαρχαῖς, τὰ πρεσβεῖα σώζειν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις. Concil. Nicen. Can. 6.

that famous Testimony to this Purpose in the sixth Canon of the *Nicene Council*. Let ancient Customs prevail; according to which, let the Bishop of Alexandria have power over them who are in Egypt, Libya, and Pentapolis; because this was likewise the Custom for the Bishop of Rome. And accordingly in Antioch and other Provinces, let the Privileges be preserved to the Churches. Which Canon is the more remarkable, because it is the first that ever was made by

the ancient Church for regulating the Rights and Privileges of Churches over each other; which there was like to be now more content about, not only by reason of the Church's Liberty under Constantine, but because of the new disposition of the Empire by him, which was made not long before the sitting of the Council of Nice. But the particular Occasion of this Canon is generally supposed to be this. Meletius an ambitious Bishop in Egypt, much about the time that Arrius broached his Herefie at Alexandria, takes upon him to ordain Bishops and others in Egypt, without the Consent of the Bishop of Alexandria. This Case being brought before the Nicene Fathers, they pronounce these Ordinations null, depose Meletius, and, to prevent the like Practices for the future, do by this Canon confirm the ancient Customs of that Nature in the Church; so that the Bishop of Alexandria should enjoy as full Right and Power over the Provinces of Egypt, Libya and Pentapolis, as the Bishop of Rome had over those subject to him, as likewise Antioch and other Churches should enjoy their former Privileges. Where we plainly see that the Ground of this Extent of Power is not attributed to any Divine right of the Bishop of Rome, or any other Metropolitan, but to the ancient Custom of the Church; whereby it had obtained that such Churches that were deduced (as it were so many Colonies) from the Mother-Church, should retain so much Respect to and Dependance upon her, as not to receive any Bishop into them without the Consent of that Bishop who governed in the Metropolis. Which was the prime Reason of the Subordination of those lesser Churches to the Metropolis. And this Custom being drawn down from the first plantation of Churches, and likewise much conducing to the preserving of Unity in them, these Nicene Fathers saw no Reason to alter it, but much to confirm it. For otherwise, there might have been continual bandying and opposition of lesser Bishops, and Churches against the greater; and therefore the Discipline and Unity of the Church did call for this Subordination; which could not be better determined than by the ancient Custom which had obtained in the several Churches. It being found most convenient that the Churches in their Subordination should be most agreeable to the Civil Disposition of the Empire. And therefore for our better understanding the Force and Effect of this Nicene Canon, we must cast our Eye a little upon the Civil Disposition of the Roman Empire by Constantine, then lately altered from the former Disposition of it under Augustus and Adrian. He therefore distributed the Administration of the Government of the Roman Empire under four Præfetti-Prætorio; but for the more convenient Management of it, the whole Body of the Empire was cast into several Jurisdictions containing many Provinces within them, which were in the Law call'd Dioceses; over every one of which there was appointed a Vicarius, or Lieutenant, to one of the Præfetti-Prætorio, whose Residence was in the chief City of the Diocese, where the Prætorium was, and Justice was administred to all within that Diocese, and thither Appeals were made. Under these were those Proconsuls or Correctores who ruled in the particular Provinces; and had their

their Residence in the *Metropolis* of it, under whom were the particular *Magistrates* of every *City*; now according to this Disposition of the *Empire*, the *Western* part of it contained in it seven of these *Dioceses*, as, under the *Præfectus-Prætorio Galliarum*, was the *Diocese* of *Gaul*, which contained seventeen *Provinces*; the *Diocese* of *Britain*, which contained five, (afterwards but three in *Constantine's* time) the *Diocese* of *Spain*, seven. Under the *præfectus-Prætorio Italia*, was the *Diocese* of *Africa*, which had six *Provinces*, the *Diocese* of *Italy*, whose Seat was *Milan*, 7. the *Diocese* of *Rome*, 10. Under the *Præfectus-Prætorio Illyrici*, was the *Diocese* of *Illyricum*, in which were seventeen *Provinces*. In the *Eastern* Division, were the *Diocese* of *Thrace*, which had six *Provinces*, the *Diocese* of *Pontus* 11. and so the *Diocese* of *Asia*, the *Oriental* (properly so called) wherein *Antioch* was, 15. all which were under the *Præfectus-Prætorio Orientis*; the *Ægyptian Diocese*, which had six *Provinces*, was under the *Præfectus Augustalis*; in the time of *Theodosius* the elder, *Illyricum* was divided into two *Dioceses*, the *Eastern*, whose *Metropolis* was *Theffalonica*, and had eleven *Provinces*, the *Western*, whose *Metropolis* was *Syrmium*, and had six *Provinces*. According to this Division of the *Empire*, we may better understand the Affairs and Government of the *Church*, which was model'd much after the same way; unless where *Ancient Custom*, or the *Emperor's Edict*, did cause any Variation. For as the *Cities* had their *Bishops*, so the *Provinces* had their *Arch-Bishops*, and the *Dioceses* their *Primates*, whose Jurisdiction extended as far as the *Diocese* did; and as the *Conventus Juridici* were kept in the chief *City* of the *Diocese* for Matters of *Civil Judicature*, so the chief *Ecclesiastical Councils* for the Affairs of the *Church*, were to be kept there too; for which there is an expresse Passage in the *Codex* of *Theodosius*, whereby care is taken, That the same Course should be used in *Ecclesiastical*, which was in *civil Matters*; so that such Things which concerned them should be heard in the *Synods* of the *Diocese*. Where the Word *Diocese* is not used in the Sence the *African Fathers* used it in, for that which belonged to one *Bishop* (as it is now used) but as it is generally used in the *Codex* of *Theodosius* and *Justinian*, and the *Novels* and *Greek Canons*; for that which comprehends in it many *Provinces*, as a *Province* takes in several *Dioceses* of particular *Bishops*.

Codex Theodos. de Episcop. l. 23.
Qui mos est causarum civilium, iidem in
negotiiis Ecclesiasticis obtinendi sunt, si
qua sunt—ad religionis observantiam per-
tinentia, locis suis & à suis dioceses Sy-
nodis audiantur.

These Things being premised, we may the better understand the Scope of the *Canon* of the *Council* of *Nice*; in which three Things are to our purpose considerable; 1. That it supposeth particular Bounds and Limits set to the Jurisdiction of those who are mentioned in it. 2. That what Churches did enjoy *Privileges* before this *Council*, had them confirmed by this *Canon*, as not to be altered. 3. That the Churches enjoying these *Privileges* were not subordinate to each other.

§. 5.

1. That particular *Bounds* and *Limits* were supposed to the Power of those Churches therein mentioned. For, although we grant that this *Canon* doth not fix or determine, What the Bounds were of the *Roman Bishop's* Power, yet that it doth suppose that it had its Bounds, is apparent from the Example being drawn from thence for the *Limits* of other Churches. For, What an unlikely thing is it, that the Church of *Rome* should be made the Pattern for assigning the *Limits* of other *Metropolitan Churches*, if that had not its known *Limits* at that Time? And, Can any thing be more absurd or unreasonable, than the Answer which *Bellarmino* gives to this place, That the *Bishop* of *Alexandria* ought to govern those *Provinces*, because the *Roman Bishop* hath so accustomed, i.e.

Quarta igitur & vera expositio est, Alex-
andrinum de bere gubernare illas provincias

quia Romanus Episcopus ita consuevit, id est, quia Romanus Episcopus ante omnem Conciliorum definitionem consuevit permittere Episcopo Alexandrino regimen Aegypti, Libya & Pentapolis. Bellarmi. de Rom. Pont. l. 2. c. 13.

saith he, *To let the Alexandrian Bishop govern them.* Here is an *id est* with a Witness. What will not these Men break through, that can so confidently obtrude such monstrous Interpretations upon the credulous World! Is it possible to conceive when the *Canon* makes use of the Parallel of the *Roman Bishop*, and makes that the Ground why the *Bishop of Alexandria* should enjoy full Power over those Provinces, because the *Bishop of Rome* did so; that the meaning should be, *That he gave the Bishop of Alexandria Power to govern those Provinces?* They who can believe such Things, may easily find Arguments for the *Pope's unlimited Supremacy* every where. I make no Scruple to grant what *Bellarmino* contends for, from the Epistle of *Nicolaus* 1. That the *Council* did not herein assign Limits to the Church of *Rome*, but made that a Pattern whereby to order the Government of other Churches. And from thence it is sufficiently clear to any reasonable Man, that the Limits of her Government were, though not assigned, yet supposed by the *Council*. For otherwise, How absurd were it to say, *Let the Bishop of Alexandria govern Egypt, Libya, and Pentapolis, because the Bishop of the Church of Rome hath no Limits at all, but governs the whole Church?* Doth not *τὸ τοιοῦτον* import some Parallel Custom in the Church of *Rome*, and name therefore what that is, supposing he hath no Limits set to his Jurisdiction? Yes, it may be you will reply, *He had Limits as a Metropolitan, but not as Head of the Church.* Grant me then, that he had Limits as *Metropolitan*, and then prove you, that ever he had any unlimited Power acknowledged as *Head of the Church*. Would they ever have made such an Instance in him, without any Discrimination of his several Capacities, if they had known any other Power that he had, but only as a *Metropolitan*? Nay, might not the *Bishops of Antioch, and Alexandria*, be rather supposed to have the greater Power, because their Provinces were much larger here than his. And although *Bellarmino* useth that as his great Argument, Why *Ruffinus* his Exposition cannot hold, *Because the Bishop of Rome would have a lesser Diocese assigned him, than either the Bishops of Antioch, or Alexandria;* yet when we consider, What hath been said already of the Agreement of the *Civil and Ecclesiastical Government*, a sufficient Account may thence be given of it. For as the *Præfectus Augustalis* had all the Provinces of *Aegypt* for his *Diocese*, so had the *Bishop of Alexandria*; and, as the *Lieutenant of Antioch* had that which was properly called the *Orient*, containing fifteen Provinces under him, so had the *Bishop of Antioch*; and by the same Proportion, the Power of the *Bishop of Rome* did correspond to the *Diocese* of the *Roman Lieutenant*, which was over those Ten Provinces, which were subject to his Jurisdiction, as it was distinct from the *Diocese* of *Italy*, which was under that *Lieutenant*, whose Residence was at *Milan*. Here we see then a Parity of Reason in all of them; and therefore I cannot but think that the true Account of the *Suburbicary Churches* in *Ruffinus* his Exposition of this *Canon*, is, that which we have now set down, viz. those Churches which lay within the ten Provinces subject to the *Roman Lieutenant*. But of them more afterwards. That which I now insist on, is, that the *Bishop of Rome* had then a limited Jurisdiction, as other *Metropolitans* and *Primates* had. Nay, if we should grant that the Title produced by *Paschasius* in the *Council of Chalcedon* to this *Canon*, were not such a Forgery as that of *Zosimus*, yet the most that could prove, was only this, That the *Roman Church* had always the *Primacy* within her *Diocese*, i. e. all *Metropolitans* Power; but not that it had an unlimited *Primacy* in the whole Church, which was a thing none of those *Fathers* who lived in the

time

Time of the four Councils, did ever acknowledge; but always opposed any thing tending to it, as appears by those very Proceedings of *Paschasius* at the Council of *Chalcedon*, and by the *Canons* of that Council, and of the Council of *Constantinople*. And it is a rare Answer to say, *That those Canons are not allowed by the Roman Church*; for by that very Answer it appears, that they did oppose the *Pope's Supremacy*, or else doubtless they would have been allowed there. But that the *Pope's Metropolitick Power* was confined within the *Roman Diocese*, so as not to extend to the *Italick*, we have this pregnant Evidence, that it appears by the occasion of the *Nicene Canon*, that the main Power contested for, was that of *Ordination*; and it is evident by *Theodoret* and *Synesius* his Epistles, that the *Bishop of Alexandria* did retain it as his due by virtue of this Canon, to ordain the *Bishops of Pentapolis* as well as *Ægypt*. But now the *Bishop of Rome* did not ordain the *Bishop of Milan* who was in the *Italick Diocese*; for *S. Ambrose* was ordained *Bishop* by a *Synod of Italy*, at the Appointment of the Emperor *Valentinian*, and by an Epistle of *Pelagius*. 1. A. D. 555. it appears that the *Bishops of Aquileia* and *Milan*, were wont to ordain each other; which, though he would have believed, was only to save Charges in going to *Rome*; yet as that learned and ingenuous Person *Petrus de Marca* observes, the true Reason of it, was, because *Milan* was the Head of the *Italick Diocese*, as appears by the Council of *Aquileia*, and therefore the Ordination of the *Bishop of Aquileia*, did of right belong to the *Bishop of Milan*; and the Ordination of the *Bishop of Milan* did belong to him of *Aquileia*, as the chief *Metropolitan* of the general *Synod of the Italick Diocese*. Although afterwards the *Bishops of Rome* got it so far into their Hands, that their Consent was necessary for such an Ordination, yet that was only when they began more openly to encroach upon the Liberties of other Churches. But, as the same learned Author goes on, those *Provinces* which lay out of *Italy*, did undoubtedly ordain their own *Metropolitans*, without the Authority or Consent of the *Bishop of Rome*, which he there largely proves of the *African*, *Spanish*, and *French Churches*. It follows then from the Scope of the *Nicene Canon*, and the Practice of the Church, that the *Bishop of Rome* had a limited Jurisdiction, as the *Bishops of Alexandria*, and *Antioch*, and other *Primates* had.

2. That what Churches did enjoy Privileges before, had them confirmed by this Canon, as not to be altered. For it makes Provision against any such Alteration, by ordaining that the ancient Customs should be in force still. And accordingly we find it decreed in the second Canon of the *Constantinopolitan Council*, That the same Limits of *Dioceses* should be observed, which were decreed in the Council of *Nice*; and that none should intrude to do any thing in the *Dioceses* of others. And by the earnest and vehement Epistles of *Pope Leo* to *Anatolius*, we see the main thing he had to plead against the Advancement of the *Patriarch of Constantinople* was, that by this means the most sacred Decrees of the Council of *Nice* would be violated. We see then, that those Privileges which belonged to Churches then, ought still to be inviolably observed; so that those Churches which then had *Primates* and *Metropolitans* of their own, might plead their own right by Virtue of the *Nicene Canon*. So we find it decreed in that Council of *Ephesus* in the famous case of the *Cyprian Bishops*; for their *Metropolitan* being dead (*Troilus* the *Bishop of Constance*) the *Bishop of Antioch* pretended that

Theodoret.
l. i. c. 9.
Synes. ep. ad
Theophil.
Alexand.

Cam vera hujus instituti ratio in eo consistat quod cum Mediolanum esset caput Dioceseos Italicae, ut constat ex Concilio Aquileiensi, ordinatio Metropolitae Aquileiensis ad Episcopum Mediolanensem optimo jure pertinebat; Primatis vero Mediolanensis ordinatio ad Aquileiensem Episcopum, quod primus esset inter Metropolitano Synodi Generalis Dioceseos Italicae. Petrus de Marca de Concord. Sacerdot. & Imp. l. 6. c. 4. sect. 7.

Ibid. sect. 8.

q. 6.

it

Concil. Ephes.
act. 7. part 2.
p. 424.

it belonged to him to ordain their *Metropolitan*, because *Cyprus* was within the civil Jurisdiction of the *Diocese* of *Antioch*; upon this the *Cyprian Bishops* make their Complaint to the *General Council* at *Ephesus*, and ground it upon that ancient Custom which the *Nicene Canon* insists on, viz. that their *Metropolitan* had been exempt from the Jurisdiction of the *Bishop* of *Antioch*, and was ordained by a *Synod* of *Cyprian Bishops*, which Privilege was not only confirmed to them by the *Ephesine Council*, but a general Decree passed, That the Rights of every Province should be preserved whole and

*Εδδξε τοίνυν τῇ ἀγίᾳ καὶ δίκηνανικῇ συνόδῳ συλλεῖσθαι ἐκαστὴν ἐπαρχίαν, καὶ βαρεῖ ἵα βατα τὰ αὐτῇ περὶ ὁρίᾳ δίκαια ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἀνωθεν κατὰ τὸ παλαιὸν κατεῖχοντο. Concil. Ephes. Can. 8. in edit. vero Bini ante Canones habetur. Tom. 2. Concil. Part. 2. Act. 7. p. 426.

inviolable, which it had of old according to ancient Custom. Which was not a Decree made merely in Favour of the *Cyprian Bishops*, but a common asserting the Rights of *Metropolitans*, that they should be held inviolate. Now therefore it appears, that all the Churches then were far from being under one of the three Patriarchs of *Rome*, *Antioch*, or *Alexandria*; for,

not only the three *Dioceses* of *Pontus*, *Asia*, and *Thracia*, were exempt (although afterwards they voluntarily submitted to the Patriarch of *Constantinople*) but likewise all those Churches which were in distinct *Dioceses* from these, had *Primates* of their own, who were independent upon any other. Upon which account it hath not only been justly pleaded in behalf of the *Britannick Churches*, that they are exempt from the Jurisdiction of the *Roman Bishop*; but it is ingenuously confessed by *Father Barnes*, That the *Britannick Church* might plead the *Cyprian Privilege*, that it was subject to no Patriarch. And, although this Privilege was taken away by Force and Tumult, yet being restored by the consent of the Kingdom, in *Henry 8. time*, and quietly enjoyed since, it ought to be retained for Peace sake, without prejudice of Catholicism, and the Brand of Schism. If so, certainly it can be no Schism, to withdraw from the usurped Authority of the *Roman Church*. But these Things have been more largely insisted on by others, and therefore I pass them over.

Insula autem Britannia gavisia est olim privilegio Cyprio ut nullius Patriarche legibus subderetur. Hoc autem Privilegium et si abolitum olim fuit bellorum tumultibus & vi, tamen cum tempore Henrici 8. totius regni consensu fuerit repetitum, & ab eo tempore pacifice praescriptum: videtur pacis ergo retineri debere, sine dispendio Catholicismi, & absq; Schismatis ullius nota. Barnes Catholico-Romanus Pacificus, MS. sect. 3.

3. From thence it follows, that there was then an *Equality*, not only among the *Patriarchs* (whose Name came not up till some time after the Council of *Nice*) but among the several *Primates* of *Dioceses*, all enjoying equal Power and Authority over their respective *Dioceses*, without Subordination to each other. But here it is vehemently pleaded by some, who yet are no *Friends* to the unlimited Power of the *Roman Bishop*, That it is hardly conceivable, that he should have no other Power in the Church, but merely as Head of the *Roman Diocese*, and that it appears by the Acts of the Church he had a regular Preheminence above others in ordering the Affairs of the Church. To which I answer, 1. If this be granted, it is nothing at all to that *Universal Pastorship* over the Church, which our Adversaries contend for, as due by Divine Right, and acknowledged to be so by consent of the Church. Let the Bishop of *Rome* then quit his former Plea, and insist only on this, and we shall speedily return an Answer, and shew, How far this *Canonical Primacy* did extend. But, as long as he challengeth a *Supremacy* upon other Grounds, he forfeits this Right, whatever it is, which comes by the Canons of the Church. 2. What merely comes by the Canons of the Church, cannot bind the Church to an absolute Submission, in case that Authority be abused to the Churches apparent Prejudice. For the Church can never give away her Power to secure her self against whatever Incroachments tend to the Injury of it. This Power then may be rescinded by the Parts of the Church, when

when it tends to the Mischief of it. 3. This *Canonical Preheminence* is not the main thing we dispute with the *Church of Rome*; let her reform her self from all those Errors and Corruptions which are in her Communion, and reduce the *Church* to the Primitive Purity and Simplicity of Faith and Worship, and then see if we will quarrel with the *Primacy* of the *Bishop of Rome*, according to the *Canons*, or any regular Preheminence in him meerly in order to the *Churches* Peace and Unity. But this is not the Case between us and them, they challenge an *unlimited Power*, and that by *Divine Right*, and nothing else will satisfy them but this, although there be neither any ground in *Scripture* for it, nor any Evidence of it in the *Practice* of the *Ancient Church*.

But however, we must see, what you produce for it: First, you say, *The Pope's Confirmation was required to all new elected Patriarchs*. To that I shall return the full and satisfactory Answer of the late renowned *Archbishop of Paris, Petrus de Marca*, where he propounds this as an Objection out of *Baronius*, and thus solves it; *That the Confirmation of Patriarchs by the Bishop of Rome, was no token of Jurisdiction, but only of receiving into Communion, and a Testimony of his Consent to the Consecration already performed.* And this was no more than was done by other *Bishops* in reference to the *Bishop of Rome* himself; for *S. Cyprian* writing to *Antonianus* about the Election of *Cornelius* saith, *That he was not only chosen by the Suffrage of the People, and Testimony of the Clergy; but that his Election was confirmed by all their Consent.* May not you then as well say, *That the Bishop of Carthage had Power over the Bishop of Rome*, because his Ordination was confirmed by him, and other *African Bishops*. But any one who had understood better than you seem to do, the Proceedings of the *Church* in those Ages, would never have made this an Argument of the *Pope's Authority* over other *Patriarchs*, since, as the same *Petrus de Marca* observes, *It was the Custom in those Times, that not only the Patriarchs but the Roman Bishop himself upon their Election, were wont to send abroad Letters, testifying their Ordination, to which was added a Profession of Faith contained in their Synodical Epistles.* Upon the receipt of which, *Communicatory Letters* were sent to the Person newly ordained, to testify their Communion with him, in case there were no just Impediment produced. So that this was only a matter of *Fraternal Communion*, and importing nothing at all of *Jurisdiction*; but the *Bishops of Rome*, who were ready to make use of all Occasions to advance their own *Grandeur*, did in time make use of this for quite other Ends, than it was primarily intended; for, in case of any Suspicions and Jealousies of any thing that might tend to the disservice of their See, they would then deny their *Communicatory Letters*, as *Simplicius* did in the case of the *Patriarch of Alexandria*. And in that Confirmation of *Anatolius* by *Leo I.* which *Baronius* so much insists on, *Leo* himself gives a sufficient account of it, viz. *to manifest that there was but one entire Communion among them throughout the World.* So that if the *Pope's* own Judgment may be taken, this Confirmation of new elected *Patriarchs* imported nothing of *Jurisdiction*. But, in case the *Popes* did deny their *Communicatory Letters*, that did not presently hinder them from

Quod ad Patriarchas attinet, responderi potest, Confirmationem illam non esse signum jurisdictionis, sed tantum suspensionis in communionem, & testimonium quo constabat, summum Pontificem consentire consecrationi jam peractæ. Petrus de Marca de Concord. c. Sacerdot. & Imper. l. 6. c. 5. sect. 2.

Factus est autem Cornelius Episcopus de Dei & Christi ejus judicio, de Clericorum pene omnium testimonio, de plebis que tunc affuit suffragio, & de Sacerdotum antiquorum & bonorum virorum Collegio — Cum Fabiani locus vacaret, quo occupato de Dei voluntate & omnium nostrum consensione Firmato. Cyprian. ep. 52. p. 75. ed. Rigalt.

Quippe usu receptum erat per illas tempestates, ut Patriarchæ, & ipse etiam Romanus Pontifex recens electus, literas de sua ordinatione mitterent; quibus addebatur professio fidei in Synodis eorum Epistolis conscripta. Petrus de Marca. ib.

Ut per totum mundum una nobis sit unitus Communionis integritas, in qua societatem tuæ dilectionis amplectimur, & gestorum quæ sumpsimus seriem, necessariis munitam subscriptionibus approbamus. Leo I. ep. 38.

the

Theodoret.
l. 5. c. 23.

the Execution of their Office; as appears by the Instance of *Flavianus*, the Patriarch of *Antioch*: for although three *Roman Bishops* successively opposed him, *Damasus*, *Syricius*, and *Anastasius*, and used great Importunity with the *Emperor*, that he might not continue in his Place, yet because the Churches of the *Orient*, *Asia*, *Pontus*, and *Thracia*, did approve of him, and communicate with him, he opposed their consent against the *Bishops* of *Rome*. Upon which, and the *Emperor's* severe checking them for their Pride and Contention, they at last promised the *Emperor*, that they would lay aside their Enmity, and acknowledge him. So that, notwithstanding whatever the *Roman Bishops* could do against him, he was acknowledged for a true Patriarch, and at last their Consent was given only by renewing Communion with him; which certainly is far from being an Instance of the Pope's Power over the other Patriarchs.

ð. 8.
P. 184.

De Concord.
l. 7. c. 1. sect. 6.

Whereby we also see, What little Power he had in deposing them; although you tell us, *That it belonged likewise to him to depose unworthy ones, and restore the unjustly deposed by others*. But, that the Power of deposing Bishops was anciently in *Provincial Councils*, appears sufficiently by the fifth Canon of the *Nicene Council*, and by the Practice of the Church, both before and after it; and it is acknowledged by *Petrus de Marcâ*, that the sole Power of deposing Bishops, was not in the Hands of the Bishop of *Rome*, till about eight hundred Years since; and refutes the *Cardinal Perron* for saying otherwise; and afterwards largely proves, that the Supreme Authority of deposing Bishops, was still in *Provincial Council*, and that the Pope had nothing to do in it, till the Decree of the *Sardican Synod*, in the case of *Athanasius*; which yet, he saith, did not (as is commonly said) decree Appeals to be made to *Rome*, but only gave the Bishop of *Rome* Power to Review their Actions, but still reserving to *Provincial Councils* that Authority which the *Nicene Council* had established them in. All the Power which he then had, was only this, that he might decree that the Matters might be handled over again, but not that he had the Power himself of deposing or restoring Bishops: Which is proved with that Clearness and Evidence by that excellent Author, that I shall refer you to him for it; and consider the Instances produced by you to the contrary. We read (say you) of no less than eight several Patriarchs of *Constantinople* deposed by the Bishop of *Rome*. Surely, if you had read this your self, you would have quoted the place, with more Care and Accuracy than you do; for you give us only a blind Citation of an Epistle of Pope *Nicolaus*, to the *Emperor Michael*, neither citing the Words, nor telling us which it is, when there are several, and those no very short ones neither. But however, it is well chosen, to have a Pope's Testimony in his own Cause, and that such a Pope who was then in Contest with the Patriarch of *Constantinople*, and that too so long after the Encroachments of the Bishops of *Rome*, it being in the ninth Century; and yet for all this, this Pope doth not say those Words which you would fasten upon him; that which he saith, is, *That none of the Bishops of Constantinople, or scarce any of them, were ejected without the consent of the Bishop of Rome*. And then instanceth in *Maximus*, *Nestorius*, *Acacius*, *Anthimus*, *Sergius*, *Pyrrhus*, *Paulus*, *Petrus*; but his design in this, is only to shew that *Ignatius* the Patriarch ought not to have been deposed without his Consent. But what is all this to the Pope's sole Power of deposing? When even at that time the Pope did not challenge it: But, supposing the Popes had done it before, it doth not follow that it was in their Power to do it, and that the Canons had given them right to do it, but least of all certainly, that they had a Divine Right for it, which never was in the

Aut nunquam omnino, aut certe vix, horum aliquis sine consensu Romani Pontificis reperitur ejectus. Nicol. l. i. epist. 8. Michael. Imp. Tom. 6. Concil. p. 506.

the least acknowledged by the Church as to a Deposition of *Patriarchs*, which you contend for. But besides this, you say, *Sixtus the third deposed Polychronius Bishop of Hierusalem*. Whereas *Sixtus* only sent eight Persons from a *Synod* at *Rome* to *Hierusalem*, who when they came there, did not offer to depose *Polychronius* by virtue of the *Pope's Power*, but a *Synod* of seventy or more neighbour Bishops were call'd, by whom he was deposed; and yet after all this, *Binius* himself condemns those *Acts* which report this Story, for spurious; there being a manifest Repugnancy in the Time of them, and no such Person as *Polychronius* ever mentioned by the *Ecclesiastical Historians* of that Time, and other fabulous Narrations inserted in them. Yet these are your goodly Proofs of the *Pope's Power* to depose *Patriarchs*. Tom. 2. Concil. p. 685.

But we must see whether you have any better Success in proving his Power to restore such as were deposed; for which you only instance in *Athanasius* and *Paulus* restored by *Julius*; whose Case must be further examined, which, in short, is this: *Athanasius* being condemned by the *Synods* of *Tyre* and *Antioch*, goes to *Rome*, where he and *Paulus* are received into Communion by *Julius*, who would not accept of the Decree of the *Eastern Bishops* which was sent after him to *Rome*. For *Pope Julius* did not formally offer to restore *Athanasius* to his Church, but only owned and received him into Communion as Bishop of *Alexandria*, and that because he looked on the Proceedings as unjust in his Condemnation. And all that *Julius* himself pleads for, is, not a Power to depose or restore *Patriarchs* himself, but only that such Things ought not to have been done without communicating those Proceedings to him, which the *Unity* of the Church might require. And therefore *Petrus de Marca* saith, that *Baronius*, *Bellarmino*, and *Perron* are all strangely out in this Story, when they would infer, That the Causes of the *Eastern Bishops* upon Appeal were to be judged by the Bishop of *Rome*: whereas all that *Julius* pleads for, is, that such Things should not be done by the *Eastern Bishops* alone, which concerned the Deposition of so great a Person in the Church as the *Patriarch* of *Alexandria*, but that there ought to be a *Council* both of the *Eastern* and *Western Bishops*; on which Account afterwards the *Sardican Synod* was called. But when we consider with what Heat and Stomach this was received by the *Eastern Bishops*, how they absolutely deny that the *Western Bishops* had any more to do with their Proceedings, than they had with theirs; when they say, that the *Pope* by this Usurpation, was the Cause of all the Mischief that followed, we see what an excellent Instance you have made choice of, to prove the *Pope's Power* of restoring *Bishops* by *Divine Right*, and that this was acknowledged by the whole Church. L. 7. c. 4. § 6.

The next Thing to be considered, is that Speech of *St. Augustine*, That in the Church of *Rome* there did always flourish the *Principality* of an *Apostolick Chair*. As to which his Lordship saith, That neither was the word *Principatus* so

In Romana Ecclesia semper Apostolica Cathedra viguit Principatus. S. Aug. Epist. 162.

great, nor the *Bishops* of those times so little, as that *Principes* and *Principatus* are not commonly given them both by the *Greek* and *Latin Fathers* of this great and learnedst Age of the Church, made up of the fourth and fifth hundred years, always understanding *Principatus* of their spiritual Power, and within the Limits of their several Jurisdictions, which perhaps now and then they did occasionally exceed. And there is not one Word in *St. Augustine*, that this *Principality* of the *Apostolick Chair* in the Church of *Rome* was then, or ought to be now exercised over the whole Church of *Christ*, as *Bellarmino* insinuates there, and as *A. C.* would have it here. To all this you say nothing to Purpose; but only tell us, That the *Bishop* by this makes way to some other pretty

P. 168.

P. 184.

D d d

Perversions

P. 169.

Perversions (as you call them) of the same Father. For we must know, say you, that he is entering upon that main Question concerning the Donatists of Africk; and he is so indeed, and that not only for clearing the meaning of St. Augustine in the present Epistle, but of the whole Controversie, to which a great Light will be given by a true account of those Proceedings. Thus then his Lordship goes on. And to prove that St. Augustine did not intend by Principatus here to give the Roman Bishop any Power out of his own Limits (which God knows were far short of the whole Church) I shall make it most manifest out of the same Epistle. For afterwards (saith St. Augustine) when the Pertinacy of the Donatists could not be restrained by the African Bishops, only they gave them leave to be heard by foreign Bishops. And after that he hath

Pergant ad Fratres & Collegas nostros transmarinorum Ecclesiarum Episcopos. S. Aug. Ep. 162.

An forte non debuit Romana Ecclesia Melchides Episcopus cum Collegis transmarinis Episcopis illud sibi usurpare iudicium quod ab Afris Septuaginta, ubi Primas Tigisitanus praesedit, fuerit terminatum. Quid quod nec ipse usurpaverit? Rogatus quippe Imperator, Judices misit Episcopos, qui cum eo sederent, & de tota illa causa, quod justum videretur, statuerent. S. Aug. ib.

these Words: And yet peradventure Melchides the Bishop of the Roman Church, with his Colleagues the transmarine Bishops, non debuit, ought not to usurp to himself this Judgment which was determined by Seventy African Bishops; Tigisitanus, sitting Primate. And what will you say if he did not usurp this Power? For the Emperor being desired sent Bishops Judges, which should sit with him, and determine what was just upon the whole Cause. In which Passage, saith his Lordship, there are very many things observable. As first, That the Roman Prelate came not in

till there was leave for them to go to Transmarine Bishops. Secondly, That if the Pope had come in without this Leave, it had been an Usurpation. Thirdly, That when he did thus come in, not by his own Authority, but by Leave, there were other Bishops made Judges with him. Fourthly, That these other Bishops were appointed and sent by the Emperor and his Power; that which the Pope least of all will endure. Lastly, Lest the Pope and his Adherents should say, this was an Usurpation in the Emperor, St. Austin tells us a little before in

Ad cuius curam, de qua rationem Deo redditurus est, res illa maxime pertinebat. Id. ib.

the same Epistle still, that this doth chiefly belong ad curam ejus, to the Emperor's Care and Charge, and that he is to give an account to God for it. And Melchides

did sit and judge the Business with all Christian Prudence and Moderation. So at this Time the Roman Prelate was not received as Pastor of the whole Church, say A. C. what he please; nor had he Supremacy over the other Patriarchs. In order to the better shaping your Answer to this Discourse, you pretend to give us a true Narrative of the Donatists Proceedings, by the same Figure that Lucian's Book is inscribed De vera historia. There are several Things therefore to be taken notice of in your Narrative, before we come to your particular Answers, whose strength depends upon the Matters of Fact.

First, You give no satisfactory Account at all, Why, if the Pope's Universal Pastorship had been then owned, the first Appeal on both Sides was not made to the Bishop of Rome, for in so great a Schism as that was between the different Parties of Cæcilian and Majorinus, To whom should they have directly gone but to Melchides then Bishop of Rome? How comes it to pass that there is no mention at all of his Judgment by either Party, till Constantine had appointed him to be one of the Judges? St. Austin indeed pleads in behalf of Cæcilian, why he would not be judged by the African Synod of LXX. Bishops, that there were thousands of his Colleagues on the other side the Sea, whom he might be tried by. But why not by the Bishop of Rome alone, if the Universal Pastorship did belong to him? But your Narrative gives us a rare Account, why the Donatists did not go to the Pope before they went to the Emperor, viz. That they durst not appear there,

Aug. ep. 162.

there, or else knew it would be to little purpose. But by what Arguments do you prove they durst not appear there before, when we see they went readily thither after the Emperor had appointed Rome for the Place, where their Cause was to be heard; if they thought it were to so little purpose? For we see the Donatists never except against the Place at all, or the Person of the Bishop of Rome; but upon the Command of Constantine made known to them by Anulinus the Proconsul of Africa, ten of their Party go to Rome to negotiate their Affairs before the Delegates. This is but therefore a very lame Account, why the first Appeal should be to the Emperor and not to the Pope, if he had been then known to be the Universal Pastor of the Church. But say you further, *The Emperor disliked their Proceedings, and told them expressly, That it belonged not to him, neither durst he act the part of a Judge in a cause of Bishops.* But on what grounds he durst not do it, we may easily judge by his undertaking it at last, and passing a final Judgment in this Cause himself after the Councils at Rome, at Arles, could not put an end to it. If Constantine had judged it unlawful, could their Importunity have excused it? and could it be any other than unlawful if the Pope were the Universal Pastor of the Church? Do you think it would be accounted a sufficient Plea among you now, for any Prince to assume to himself the Judgment of any Cause already determined by the Pope, because of the Importunity of the Persons concerned in it? Indeed Constantine did at first prudently wave the Business himself, and that I suppose the rather, because the Donatists in their Petition had intreated, that some of the Bishops of Gaul might umpire the Business; either because that was then the Place of the Emperor's Residence, or else that Gaul under Constantius had escaped the late Persecution, and therefore were not liable to the Suspicion of those Crimes whereof Cæcilian and Felix of Aptung were accused. But however, though Constantine did not sit as Judge himself, he appointed Marinus, Rheticius, and Maternus, to join with Melchiades the Bishop of Rome in the determining this Case. But this he did, you say, to comply with the Donatists. What, to join other Bishops with the Head of the Church in equal Power for deciding Controversies? and all this merely to comply with the Schismatical Donatists? Was this, think you, becoming one who believed the Pope's Universal Pastourship by Divine Right? Well fare then the Answer of others who love to speak plain Truths, and impute all these Proceedings to Constantine's Ignorance of his Duty, being yet but a Catechumen in Christian Religion, and therefore did, he knew not what: But methinks the Universal Pastor, or some of those nineteen Bishops who sat at Rome in this Business, or of those two hundred who you say met afterwards at Arles about it, should have a little better instructed him in his Duty; and not let him go so far on in it, as from delegating Judges to hear it, and among them the Head of the Church, to resume it afterwards himself both to hear and determine it. If the Emperor had (as you say) protested against this as in it self unlawful, would none of the Bishops hinder him from doing it? But where doth Constantine profess against it as in it self unlawful? if so, no Circumstances, no Importunities could ever make it lawful: Unless you think the Importunity of Joseph's Mistress would have made Adultery no Sin in him. If Constantine said he would ask the Bishop's Pardon in it, that might be, as looking on them as the more competent Judges, but not thinking it unlawful in it self for him to do, as you say.

Well, but you tell us, *It was rather the Justice and Moderation of the Roman Prelate, that became not in before it was due Time, and the matter orderly brought before him.* I am very much of your mind in this, and if all Popes

Euseb. l. 10. c. 5.

since *Melchiades* had used the same *Justice and Moderation*, to have staid till Things had been orderly brought to them, and not usurped upon the Privileges of other Churches, Things had been in a far better Condition in the Christian World than they are. Had there been none but such as *Melchiades*, who shewed so much Christian Prudence and Moderation in the Management of this Business, that great *Schism*, which your Church hath caused by her arrogant Pretences, might have been prevented. But how come you to know, that this Case did properly belong to the Pope's Cognizance? Who told you this? to be sure not the Emperor *Constantine*, who in his Epistle to *Miltiades*, extant in *Eusebius*, intimates no such thing; but only writes to him as one delegated to hear that Cause with the other Bishops, and gives him Instructions in order to it. Do the *Donatists* or their Adversaries mention any such thing? Doth the Pope himself ever exprets or intimate it? It seems, he wanted your Information much at that time. Or it may be, like the late Pope *Innocent* in the case of the five Propositions, he might say, *he was bred no Divine*, and therefore might the less understand his Duty. But can it possibly enter into your Head, That this Case came to the Pope at last by way of regular Appeal, as you seem to assert afterwards? Is this the way of Appeals to go to the Emperor and Petition him to appoint Judges to hear the Case? If the case of Appeals must be determined from these Proceedings, to be sure, the last Resort will be to the Emperor himself, as well as the first Appeal.

P. 187.

Whether the African Bishops gave leave to the *Donatists* to be heard by foreign Bishops, or they took it themselves, is not much material, because the *Schism* was so great at Home, that there was no likelihood of any ending the Controversie by standing to a fair Arbitration among themselves. And therefore there seemed a Necessity on both Sides of referring the Business to some unconcerned Persons, who might hear the Allegations, and judge indifferently between them. And no other way did the nineteen Bishops at Rome proceed with them, but as indifferent Arbitrators; and therefore the Witnesses and Allegations on both Sides were brought before them; but we read of no Power at all challenged absolutely to bind the Persons to the Judgment of the Church of Rome, as the final Judgment in the case. The Question, Whether the Pope had usurped this Power or no, depends not upon the *Donatists* Question, Whether *Melchiades* ought to have undertaken the Judgment of that Cause which had been already determined by a Synod of LXX. Bishops in Africa? But upon St. *Augustin's* Answer, who justifies the lawfulness of his doing it, because he was thereto appointed by the Emperor. But when you say, St. *Austin* gives this Answer only per *ἐπιεικείαν*, by way of Condescension to his Adversaries way of speaking: you would do well to prove elsewhere from St. *Austin*, that when he lays aside his Rhetorick, he ever speaks otherwise, but that it would have been an Usurpation in the Pope to challenge to himself the hearing of those Causes which had been determined by African Bishops. But what St. *Augustine's* Judgment, as well as the other African Fathers was in this Point, abundantly appears from the Controversies between them and the Bishop of Rome in the case of Appeals. It sufficiently appears already, That neither our Saviour, nor the Canons of the Universal Church, gave the Pope leave to hear and judge the Causes of St. *Athanasius* and other Patriarchs and Bishops of the Church; and therefore you were put to your Shifts when you run thither for Security. But that which follows is notoriously false, That when he did so interpose, no Man (no not the Persons themselves who were interested and suffered by his Judgment) complained or accused him of Usurpation; when in the case of *Athanasius* it is so vehemently pleaded

pleaded by the *Eastern Bishops*, that the *Pope* had nothing at all to do in it; but they might as well call in Question what was done at *Rome*, as he what was done at *Antioch*. Nay, name us any one Cause in that Age of the *Church*, where the *Pope* did offer to meddle in Matters determined by other *Bishops*, which he was not opposed in, and the Persons concern'd did not complain and accuse him of meddling with what he had no Right to, which are but other Words for *Usurpation*.

You say, *The Bishops whom the Emperor sent as Judges with the Pope, were an inconsiderable Number to sway the Sentence*. It seems three to one are with you an inconsiderable Number. But say you, *The Pope to shew his Authority added fifteen other Bishops of Italy to be his Colleagues and Assistants in the Business*. Either these fifteen *Bishops* were properly *Judges* in the Cause, or only *Assistants* for better Management and speedier Dispatch; if they were *Judges*, how prove you that *Constantine* did not appoint them? if they were only *Assistants* and *Suffragans* to the Bishop of *Rome*, as is most probable (except *Merocles* Bishop of *Milan*) what *Authority* did the *Pope* shew in calling his *Suffragans* to his Assistance in a matter of that Nature, which required so much Examination of *Witnesses*? But the *Pope* had more effectually shewn his *Authority*, if he had refused the *Bishops* whom *Constantine* sent; and told him he meddled with that which did not concern him, to appoint any *Judges* at all in a matter of *Ecclesiastical Cognizance*, and that it was an insufferable Presumption in him to offer to send three underling *Bishops* to sit with him in deciding Controversies; as though he were not the *Universal Pastor* of the *Church* himself, to whom alone by *Divine Right* all such things did belong. Such Language as this would have become the *Head of the Church*; and in that indeed he had shewn his *Authority*. But for him sneakingly to admit other *Bishops* as *Joint Commissioners*, forsooth, with him; and that by the *Emperor's* Appointment too; What did he else but betray the *Rights* of his *See*, and expose his *Infallible Headship* to great Contempt? Do you think that *Pope Hildebrand*, or any of his *Successors* would have done this? No, they understood their Power far better than so; and the *Emperor* should have known his own, for offering such an *Affront* to his *Holiness*. And if his *Bay-leaves* did not secure him, the *Thunderbolts* of Excommunication might have lighted on him to his Prejudice. For Shame then never say, *That Pope Miltiades shewed his Authority*; but rather give him over among those good *Bishops* of *Rome*, but *bad Popes*, who knew better how to suffer *Martyrdom*, than assert the *Authority* of the *Roman See*. I pray imagine but *Paul 5.* or any other of our stout-spirited *Popes* in *Miltiades* his Place, Would they have taken such Things at *Constantine's* Hands as poor *Miltiades* did? and, for all that we see, was very well contented too; and thought he did but his Duty in doing what the *Emperor* bid him. Would they have been contented to have had a Cause once passed the *Infallible Judgment* of the *Roman See*, to be resumed again, and handled in another *Council*, as though there could be any Suspicion that all Things were not rightly carried there? And that after all this too, the *Emperor* should undertake to give the final Decision to it? Would these Things have been born with by any of our *Infallible Heads* of the *Church*? But good *Miltiades* must be excused, he went as far as his Knowledge Carried him, and thought he might do good Service to the *Church* in what he did; and that was it he looked at more than the *Grandeur* of his *See*. The good *Bishops* then were just crept out of the *Flames* of Persecution, and they thought it a great Matter that they had *Liberty* themselves, and did not much concern themselves about those *Usurpations* which the

Q. II.

Pride

Pride and Ease of the following Ages gave occasion for. They were sorry to see a *Church* that had survived the cruel *Flames* of *Dioclesian's* Persecution, so suddenly to feel *new ones* in her own Bowels; that a *Church* whose Constitution was so strong as to endure *Martyrdoms*, should no sooner be at ease but she begins to putrifie, and to be *fly-blown* with Heats and Divisions among her Members; and that her own *Children* should rake in those Wounds, which the Violence of her professed Enemies had caused in her; and therefore these good *Bishops* used their Care and Industry to close them up; and rather rejoiced they had so good an *Emperor* who would concern himself so much in healing the *Church's Breaches*, than dispute his *Authority* or disobey his *Commands*. And if *Constantine* doth express himself unwilling to engage himself to meddle in a *Business* concerning the *Bishops* of the *Church*, it was out of his tender Respect to those *Bishops* who had manifested their Piety and Sincerity so much in their late persecutions, and not from any *Question* of his own *Authority* in it. For that he after sufficiently asserted, not only in his own Actions, but when the Case of *Felix* of *Aptung* was thought not sufficiently scanned at *Rome*, in appointing (about

Valerius de Schismate Donatist cap. 11.

Alit quidam, Non debuit Episcopus Proconsulari iudicio purgari: quasi verò ipse sibi hoc comparaverit, ac non Imperator ita queri jussisset, ad cuius curam de qua rationem Deo redditurus esset, res illa maxime pertinebat. Augustin. ep. 162.

four Months after the Judgment at *Rome*) *Ælianus* the *Proconsul* of *Africa* to examine the Case of *Felix* the *Bishop* of *Aptung*, who had ordained *Cæcilian*. To this the *Donatists* pleaded, *That a Bishop ought not to be tried by Proconsular Judgment*: to which *St. Austin* Answers, *That it was not his own seeking, but the Emperor's appointing, to whose Care and Charge that Business did chiefly belong, of which he must give an Account to God.* And can

it now enter into any Head but *yours*, that for all this the *Emperor* looked on the Judgment of this Cause as a *Thing not belonging to his Authority*? They who can believe such Things as these, and notwithstanding all the Circumstances of this Story can think the *Pope's Universal Pastorship* was then owned, the most I can say of them, is, that they are in a fair way to believe *Transubstantiation*; there being nothing so improbable, but upon equal Grounds they may judge it true.

¶ 12.
P. 170.

That the Pope had no Supremacy over other Patriarchs, his Lordship saith, *That, were all other Records of Antiquity silent, the Civil Law is Proof enough; And that's a Monument of the Primitive Church. The Text there is, A Patriarchâ non datur appellatio. From a Patriarch there lies no Appeal. No appeal, Therefore every Patriarch was alike Supreme in his own Patriarchate. Therefore the Pope then had no Supremacy over the whole Church. Therefore certainly not then received as Universal Pastor.* Two Things you answer to

*Coel. l. 1. Tit. 4.
l. 29. Authent.
Collat. 9. tit.
15. c. 22.*

P. 188. n. 4.

this. 1. *That this reacheth not the Difference between Patriarchs themselves, whomust have some higher ordinary Tribunal, where such Causes may be heard and determined.* Very well argued against the *Pope's* Power of Judging: For, in Case of a Difference between him and the other *Patriarchs*, who must decide the Difference? Himself no doubt! But still, it is your way to beg that you can never prove. For you herein suppose the *Pope* to be above all *Patriarchs*, which you know is the Thing in dispute. Or, Do you suppose it very possible, that other *Patriarchs* may quarrel and fall out among themselves; but that the *Popes* are always such mild and good Men, that it is impossible any should fall out with them, or they with others; that still they must stand by as unconcerned in all the Quarrels of the *Christian World*, and be ready to receive Complaints from all Places. If therefore a *General Council* must not be the Judge in this Case, I pray name somewhat else more agreeable to Reason, and the Practice of the *Church*. But you answer,

answer. 2. *What the Law saith, is rightly understood, and must be explicated of inferiour Clerks only, who were not (of ordinary course) to appeal further than the Patriarch, or the Primate of their Province. For so the Council of Africk determines. But 'tis even there acknowledged, that Bishops had power in their own Causes to appeal to Rome.* This answer of yours necessarily leads us to the Debates of the great Case of Appeals to Rome, as it was managed between the *African Bishops*, and the *Bishops of Rome*, by which we shall easily discover the *weakness* of your Answer, and the most palpable *Fraud* of your Citation; by which we may see, What an excellent cause you have to manage, which cannot be defended but by such *Frauds* as here you make use of, and hope to impose upon your Reader by. Your Answer therefore in the general is, *That the Laws concerning Appeals, did only concern inferiour Clergy men; but that Bishops were allowed to appeal to Rome, even by the Council of Africk, which not only decreed it, but acknowledged it in an Epistle to Pope Boniface.* And therefore for our through Understanding the Truth in this Case, those Proceedings of the *African Church* must be briefly explained, and truly represented. Two Occasions the *Churches of Africa* had to determine in the Case of Appeals to Rome; the first in the *Milevitan*, the second in the *Carthaginian Councils*: In both which we have several Things very considerable to our Purpose. In the *Milevitan Council* they decree, *That whosoever would appeal beyond the Sea, should not be received into Communion by any in Africa*; which Decree is supposed by some to be occasioned by *Cælestius*, having recourse to Pope *Zosimus*, after he had been condemned in *Africa*. No doubt, those prudent *Bishops* began to be quickly sensible of the monstrous Inconvenience which would speedily follow upon the permission of such Appeals to Rome; for by that means they should never preserve any Discipline in their Churches, but every Person, who was called in Question for any Crimes, would slight the *Bishops* of those Churches, and presently appeal to Rome. To prevent which mischief, they make that excellent Canon, which allows only liberty of appealing to the Councils of *Africa*, or to the *Primates* of their Province, but absolutely forbids all foreign Appeals. All the Difficulty is, Whether this Canon only concerned the *Inferiour Clergy*, as you say, (and which is all that the greatest of your side have said in it) or, whether it doth not take away all Appeals of *Bishops* too. For which we need no more than produce the Canon it self, as it is extant in the authentick Collection of the *Canons of the African Church*. In which is an express Clause, *declaring that the same thing had been often determined in the Case of Bishops*. Which, because it strikes home, therefore *Perron* and others have no other shift, but to say, That this Clause was not in the original *Milevitan Canons*, but was inserted afterwards. But why do not they, who assert such bold Things, produce the true authentick Copy of these *Milevitan Canons*? That we may see, What is genuine, and what not: But, suppose we should grant, that this Clause was inserted afterwards, it will be rather for the Advantage, than Prejudice of our Cause. For which we must consider, That in the time of *Aurelius*, Bishop of *Carthage*, there had been very many Councils celebrated there: No fewer than seventeen *Iustellus* and others reckon. But a general Council meeting at *Carthage*, A. D. 419. (which was about three Years after that *Milevitan Council*, which was held 416. as appears by the Answer of *Innocentius* to it, A. D. 417.) at the end of the first Session they reviewed the *Canons* of those lesser Councils, and out of them all composed that *Codex Canonum Ecclesiæ Africanæ*, as *Iustellus* at large proves

Concil. Afric.
Can. 101.
Epist. ad Boni-
fac.

Item placuit ut Presbyteri, diaconi, vel ceteri inferiores Clerici, in causis quas habuerint, si de iudiciis episcoporum suorum questi fuerint, vicini episcopi, eos cum consensu episcopi sui audiant, & inter eos definiant, adhibiti ab eis episcopi: quod si & ab iis provocandum putaverint, non provocent ad transmarina iudicia; sed ad primates suarum provinciarum, aut ad universale Concilium; Sicut de Episcopis sæpe constitutum est. Ad transmarina autem qui putaverit appellandum, a nullo intra Africam ad Communionem suscipiatur, Codex Canon. Eccles. African. Can. 28.

proves in the Preface to his Edition of it. So that if this Clause were inserted, it must be inserted then, for it is well known, that the Case of *Appeals* was then at large debated; and by that means it received a more general Authority by passing in this *African Council*. And hence it was that this *Canon* passed with this Clause into the *Greek Churches*; for *Balsamon* and *Zonaras* both acknowledge it; and not only they, but many ancient *Latin Copies* had it too, and is so received and pleaded by the *Council of Rhemes*; as *Hincmarus*, and others, have already proved. But *Gratian* hath helped it well out, for he hath added a brave Antidote at the end of it, by putting to it a very useful Clause, *Nisi forte Romanam Sedem appellaverit*; by which the *Canon* makes excellent Sense, that none shall appeal to *Rome*, unless they do appeal to *Rome*; for none who have any understanding of the state of those *Churches* at that time, do make the least Question, but the intent of the *Canon* was to prohibit Appeals to *Rome*; but then, say they, They were only the Appeals of the *Inferiour Clergy*, which were to be ended by the *Bishops of their own Province*.

§. 13.

But this Answer is very unreasonable on these Accounts. 1. If Appeals do of right belong to the *Bishop of Rome*, as *Universal Pastor of the Church*, then, Why not the Appeals of the *Inferiour Clergy*, as well as *Bishops*? Indeed, if Appeals were challenged only by Virtue of the *Canons*, and those *Canons* limit one, and not the other (as the most eager Pleadors for Appeals in that Age, pleaded only the *Canons* of the *Church* for them) then there might be some reason, Why one should be restrained, and not the other; but if they belong to him by *Divine Right*, then all Appeals must necessarily belong to him. 2. If Appeals belong to the *Pope*, as *Universal Pastor*, then no *Council* or Persons had any thing to do to determine who should appeal, and who not. For this were an usurping of the *Pope's Privilege*, for he to whom only the right of Appeals belongs, can determine, Who should appeal, and who not; and where, and by whom those Controversies should be ended. So that the very Act of the *Council* in offering to limit Appeals, implies, that they did not believe any such *Universal Pastors*hip in the *Pope*; for, had they done so, they would have waited his Judgment, and not offered to have determined such Things themselves. 3. The Appeals of the upper and inferiour Clergy, cannot be supposed to be separate from each other. For the Appeal of a *Presbyter* doth suppose the Impeachment of the *Bishop* for some Wrong done to him, as in the Case of *Apianus*, accusing *Urban* the *Bishop of Sicca* for excommunicating him. So that the *Bishop* becomes a party in the Appeal of a *Presbyter*. And if Appeals be allowed to the *Bishop*, it is supposed to be in his Favour, for clearing of his right the better; and if it be denied to the *Presbyter*, it would favour too much of Injustice and Partiality. 4. The reason of the *Canon* extends to one as well as the other, which must be supposed to prevent all those Troubles and Inconveniencies which would arise from the liberty of Appeals to *Rome*; and, would not these come as well by the Appeals of *Bishops*, as of *Inferiour Clergy*? Nay, Doth not the *Canon* insist on that, that no Appeals should be made from the *Council of Bishops*, or the *Primates of Africa*; but, in case of *Bishops* Appeals, this would be done as well as the other; and therefore they are equally against the Reason and Design of the *Canon*. 5. The Case of *Presbyters*, may be as great and considerable as that of *Bishops*, and as much requiring the Judgment of the *Universal Pastor of the Church*. As, for Instance, that very Case which probably gave occasion to the *Milevitan Canon*, viz. the going of *Cælestius* to *Rome*, being condemned of Heresie in *Africa*: Now, What greater Cause could there be made an Appeal to *Rome* in, than in so great a matter of Faith as that was, about the Necessity of Grace? And therefore *Petrus de Marcâ* proves at large against *Perron*, that in the Epistle of *Innocent*

De Concord.
Sacerdot. &
Imp. l. 7. c. 13.
sect. 6, 7. 9.

Innocent to Vidricius, where it is said, *That the greater Causes must be referred to the Apostolick See*, is not to be understood only of the *Causes of Bishops*, but may refer to the *Causes of Presbyters* too, i. e. when they either concern *Matter of Faith*, or some doubtful Piece of *Church Discipline*. 6. The *Pope*, notwithstanding this *Canon*, looked on himself as no more hindered from receiving the Appeals of *Presbyters*, than those of *Bishops*. If therefore any Difference had been made by any Act of the *Church*, surely the *Pope* would have remanded *Presbyters* back to their own *Provinces* again; but, instead of that, we see, he received the Appeal of *Apiarius*. But, for this, a rare Answer is given, viz. *that though the Presbyters were forbidden to appeal, yet the Pope was not forbidden to receive them, if they did appeal*. But, to what Purpose then were such Prohibitions made, if the *Pope* might by his open Incouragement of them upon their Appeals to him, make them not value such *Canons* at all; for they knew, if they could but get to *Rome*, they should be received for all them.

Notwithstanding all which hath been said, you tell us, *That in the Council of Africk it was acknowledged, that Bishops had power in their own Cause, to appeal to Rome*; for which you cite in your Margent, part of an *Epistle of the Council to Boniface*. But, with what honesty and Integrity you do this, will appear by the Story. *Apiarius* then appealing to *Zosimus*, he sends over *Faustinus* to *Africa*, to negotiate the Business of Appeals, and to restore *Apiarius*, for which he pleads the *Nicene Canons* (an Account of which will be given afterwards) the *Fathers* all protest they could find no such thing there, but they agree to send Deputies into the *East*, to fetch the true *Canons* thence (as hath been related already) in the mean time *Zosimus* dies, and *Boniface* succeeds him; but for the better Satisfaction of the *Pope*, the *Council of Carthage* dispatch away a Letter to *Boniface*, to give him an Account of their Proceedings; in which *Epistle* (extant in the *African Code of Canons*) after they have given an Account of the Business of *Apiarius*, they proceed to the Instructions which *Faustinus* brought with him to *Africa*, the chief of which is that concerning Appeals to be made to *Rome*, and then follow those Words which you quote, in which they say, *That in a Letter written the Year before to Zosimus, they had granted liberty to Bishops, to appeal to Rome*; and that therein they had intimated so much to him. Thus far you are right; but there is usually some Mystery couched in your &c. for you know very well, where to cut off Sentences; for, had you added but the next Words, they had spoiled all your foregoing; there being contained in them, the full Reason of what went before, viz. *That because the Pope pretended that the Appeals of Bishops were contained in the Nicene Canons, they were contented to yield that it should be so, till the true Canons were produced*. And is this now all their Acknowledgment, that *Bishops* might in their own Causes appeal to *Rome*, when they made only a *Provisional Decree*, What should be done till the Matter came to a Resolution? But if you will thoroughly understand what their final Judgment was in this Business, I pray read their excellent *Epistle to Pope Celestine*, who succeeded *Boniface*; after they had received the *Nicene Canons* out of the *East*. Which being so excellent a Monument of *Antiquity*, and giving so great light to our present Controversie, I shall at large recite and render it, so far as concerns this Business. After our bounden Duty of Salutation, we earnestly beseech you, that hereafter you admit not so easily your Ears those that come from hence, and that you admit no more

Q. 14.

Ut Romam liceat Episcopis provocare & ut Clericorum cause apud suarum provinciarum episcopos finiantur, jam priore anno etiam literis nostris ad eundem venerabilis memorie Zosimum episcopum datis, insinuari curavimus, &c.
Ut ea servare sine ulla ejus injuria paupers fineremus, usq; adquisitionem statutorum Concilii Niceni.

Præfato itaq; debite Salutationis officio, impendio deprecamur, ut deinceps ad vestras aures hinc venientes non facilius admittatis, nec a nobis excommunicatos in

communione ultra velitis excipere; quia hoc etiam Niceno Concilio definitum facile advertet Venerabilitas tua. Nam etsi de inferioribus Clericis vel de Laicis videtur ibi praeceperit, quanto magis hoc de episcopis voluit observari, id in sua Sanctitate praeproperè, vel indebitè videatur communioni restitui. Presbyterorum quoque & sequentium Clericorum improba refugia, sicut te dignum est, repellat sanctitas tua, quia & nulla Patrum definitione hoc ecclesiae derogatum est Africanæ, & decreta Nicena sive inferioris gradus Clericos sive ipsos episcopos suis Metropolitanis apertissime commiserunt. Prudentissime enim iustissimeque viderunt, quaecumque negotia in suis locis, ubi orta sunt, finienda; nec unicuique provincia graviam Sancti Spiritus deferendam: quæ aequitas à Christi Sacerdotibus, & prudenter videatur, & constantissime teneatur: maxime quia unicuique concessum est, si iudicio offensus fuerit cognitorum, ad Concilia sua provincia, vel etiam Universale provocare. Nisi forte quisquam est qui credat, unicuique posse Deum nostrum examinis inspirare iustitiam; & innumerabilibus congregatis in Concilio Sacerdotibus denegare. Aut quomodo ipsum transmarinum iudicium ratum erit, ad quod testium necessaria persona vel propter sexum, vel propter senectutis infirmitatem, vel multis aliis impedimentis adduci non poterunt? Nam ut aliqui tanquam à tue sanctitatis latere mittantur, nulla invenimus Patrum Synodo constitutum. Quia illud quod pridem per eundem coepiscopum Faustinum tanquam ex parte Nicæni Concilii exinde transmissis, in Conciliis verioribus quæ accipiuntur Nicæni, à S. Cyrillo coepiscopo nostro Alexandrinæ Ecclesiae, & à venerabili Attico Constantinopolitano Antistite, ex authentico missis, quæ etiam ante hoc per Innocentium Presbyterum & Marcellum Subdiaconum, per quos ad nos ab iis directæ sunt, venerabilis memoria Bonifacio episcopo decessori vestro à nobis transmissæ sunt, in quibus tale aliquid non possumus invenire. Executores etiam Clericos vestros quibusque petentibus nolite mittere, ne fumosum typhum sæculi in Ecclesiam Christi quæ lucem simplicitatis & humilitatis diem Deum videre cupientibus præfert, videamur inducere. Nam de fratre nostro Faustino (amato jam, pro suis nefandis nequitiiis, de Christi Ecclesiâ dolendo Apiario) securi sumus, quod eum probitate ac moderatione tuæ sanctitatis, salvâ fraternâ

into Communion, those whom we have cast out: For your Reverence will easily perceive, that this is forbid by the Council of Nice. For if this be taken care for, as to the Inferiour Clergy and Laity, How much more would it have it to be observed in Bishops; that so they who are in their own Province suspended from Communion, be not hastily or unduly admitted by your Holiness. Let your Holiness also reject the wicked Refuges of Priests and Inferiour Clerks; for no Canon of the Fathers hath taken that from the Church of Africk; and the Decrees of Nice hath subjected both the Inferiour Clergy, and Bishops, to their Metropolitans. For they have most wisely and justly provided, that every Business be determined in the place where it begun: and that the Grace of the Holy Spirit will not be wanting to every Province, that so Equity may be prudently discovered, and constantly held by Christ's Priests. Especially seeing that it is lawful to every one, if he be offended, to appeal to the Council of the Province, or even to an Universal Council. Unless perhaps that somebody believe that God can inspire to every one of us, the justice of Examination of a Cause, and refuse it to a multitude of Bishops assembled in Council. Or, How can a Judgment made beyond the Sea be valid, to which the Persons of necessary Witnesses cannot be brought, by reason of the Infirmary of their Sex and Age, or of many other intervening Impediments? For this sending of Men to us from your Holiness, we do not find commanded by any Synod of the Fathers. And as for that which you did long since send to us by Faustinus our Fellow-Bishop, as belonging to the Council of Nice, we could not find it in the truest Copies of the Council, sent by holy Cyril our Colleague, Bishop of Alexandria, and by the venerable Atticus Bishop of Constantinople: which also we sent to your Predecessor Boniface, of happy Memory, by Innocent a Presbyter, and Marcellus a Deacon. Take heed also of sending to us any of your Clerks for Executors, to those who desire it, lest we seem to bring the swelling Pride of the World into the Church of Christ, which beareth the Light of Simplicity, and the Brightness of Humility before them that desire to see God. And concerning our Brother Faustinus (Apiarius being now for his Wickedness cast out of the Church of Christ) we are confident, that our brotherly Love continuing through the Goodness and Moderation of your Holiness, Africa shall no more be troubled with him.

charitate ulterius Africa minime patiat. Concil. Carthag. Epist. ad Celestinum.

Thus I have at large produced this noble Monument of the Prudence, Courage and Simplicity of the African Fathers; enough to put any reasonable man out of the fond Conceit of an Universal Pastorship of the Bishop of Rome. I wonder not that Baronius saith, *There are some hard things in this Epistle, that Perron sweats*

sweats and toils so much to so little Purpose, to enervate the force of it; for as long as the Records of it last, we have an impregnable Bulwark against the *Usurpations* of the Church of Rome. And methinks you might blush for Shame, to produce those *African Fathers*, as determining the Appeals of *Bishops of Rome*, who, with as much Evidence and Reason, as Courage and Resolution, did finally oppose it. What can be said more convincingly against these *Appeals*, than is here urged by them: That they have neither Authority from *Councils*, nor any Foundation in *Justice* and *Equity*; that *God's Presence* was as well in *Africk* as *Rome* (no doubt then they never imagined any *Infallibility* there) that the Proceedings of the *Roman Bishop* were so far from the *Simplicity* and *Humility* of the Gospel, that they tended only to nourish swelling *Pride*, and *secular Ambition* in the Church. That the Pope had no Authority to send *Legats* to hear Causes, and they hoped they should be no more troubled with such as *Faustinus* was. All these things are so evident in this Testimony, that it were a Disparagement to it to offer more at large to explain them. I hope then, this will make you sensible of the Injury you have done the *African Fathers*, by saying, That they determined, the Causes of *Bishops* might be heard at *Rome*.

Your Answer to the place of *S. Gregory*, which his Lordship produceth concerning Appeals, viz. *That the Patriarch is to put a final end to those Causes, which come before him by Appeal from Bishops and Arch-Bishops*, is the very same, that it speaks only of the *Inferiour Clergy*, and therefore is taken off already. But you wonder his Lordship should expose to view the following Words of *S. Gregory*, where there is neither *Metropolitan*, nor *Patriarch* of that *Diocese*, there they are to have recourse to the *See Apostolick*, as being the Head of all Churches. Then surely it follows, say you. the *Bishop of Rome's Jurisdiction*, is not only over the *Western*, and *Southern Provinces*, but over the whole Church, whither the *Jurisdiction* of *Patriarchs* and *Metropolitans* never extended. See how well you make good the common saying, That *Ignorance is the cause of Admiration*; for, Wherefore should you wonder at his Lordships producing these Words; if you had either understood, or considered the abundant Answers which he gives to them? 1. *That if there be a Metropolitan, or a Patriarch, in those Churches, his Judgment is final, and there ought to be no Appeal to Rome.* 2. *It is as plain, that in those ancient Times of Church-Government, Britain was never subject to the See of Rome* (of which afterwards.) 3. *It will be hard for any man to prove, that there were any Churches then in the World, which were not under some, either Patriarch or Metropolitan.* 4. *If any such were, 'tis gratis dictum, and impossible to be proved, that all such Churches, where ever seated in the World, were obliged to depend on Rome.* And, Do you still wonder why his Lordship produces these Words? I may more justly wonder why you return no Answer to what his Lordship here says. But still the *Caput omnium Ecclesiarum* sticks with you; if his Lordship hath not particularly spoken to that, it was, because his whole Discourse was sufficient to a Man of ordinary Capacity, to let him see, that no more could be meant by it, but some *Preheminence* of that Church above others in regard of *Order* and *Dignity*, but no such thing as *Universal Power* and *Jurisdiction* was to be deduced from it. And if *Gregory* understood more by it, as his Lordship saith, 'Tis *gratis dictum*, and *Gregory* himself was not a Person to be believed in his own Cause. But now, as you express it, his Lordship takes a leap from the Church of Rome, to the Church of England: No, neither his Lordship, nor we, take a leap from thence hither; but you are the Men who leap over the Alps, from the Church of England, to that of Rome. We plead as his Lordship doth truly, *That in the ancient times of the Church, Britain was never subject to the See of Rome, but being one of the*

P. 189.

Western Dioceses of the Empire, it had a Primate of its own. This, you say, his Lordship should have proved, and not merely said. But, What an unreasonable man are you, who would put his Lordship to prove *Negatives*; if you challenge a Right which the *Pope* hath over us, it is your Business to prove it; his Lordship gave a sufficient Reason for what he said, *in saying that Britain was one of the Dioceses of the Empire, and therefore had a Primate of her own.* This you deny not, but say, this only proves, *That the Inferiour Clergy could not appeal to Rome.* What again? But this Subterfuge hath been prevented already. But to pass by what without any Shadow of Proof you say of the *Patriarch of Constantinople's being subject to the Pope*; and *Pope Urban's calling Anselm the Patriarch of the other World*; which we are far from making the least ground to make *Canterbury* a *Patriarchal See*; which, as far as concerns the Rights of *Primacy*, was so long before the *Synod of Bar in Apulia*; we come to that which is more material, *viz.* your attempt to prove, *That Britain was anciently subject to the See of Rome*; for which you instance in *Wilfrid, Arch-Bishop of York, appealing to Rome, about A. D. 673. who was restored to his Bishoprick, by virtue of the Sentence passed in his behalf at Rome; and so being a second time expelled, appealed as formerly, and was again restored.* To which I shall return you a clear and full Answer in the Words of another *Arch-Bishop*, the late learned *L. Primate of Ireland.* "The most famous, saith he, (I had almost said the "only) Appellant from *England* to *Rome* that we read of before the Con-
quest, was *Wilfrid Arch-bishop of York*, who, notwithstanding that he
gained Sentence upon Sentence at *Rome* in his Favour; and notwithstand-
ing that the *Pope* did send expresse *Nuncios* into *England*, on purpose to
see his Sentence executed; yet he could not obtain his Restitution or the
Benefit of his Sentence for six Years, during the Reigns of *King Egbert*
and *Alfred* his Son. Yea, *King Alfred* told the *Pope's Nuncios* expressly,
That he honoured them as his Parents for their grave Lives and honourable
Aspects; but he could not give any Assent to their Legation, because it was
against Reason, that a Person twice condemned by the whole Council of the En-
glish should be restored upon the *Pope's Letter*. If they had believed the *Pope*
to be their competent Judge, either as *Universal Monarch*, or so much as
Patriarch of Britain, or any more than an honourable *Arbitrator* (which
all the *Patriarchs* were, even without the Bounds of their proper Jurisdi-
ctions) How comes it to pass that two *Kings* successively, and the great
Councils of the *Kingdom*, and the other *Arch-bishop Theodore* with all the
prime *Ecclesiasticks*, and the Flower of the *English Clergy*, did so long and
so resolutely oppose so many Sentences and Messages from *Rome*, and con-
demn him twice whom the *Pope* had absolved? Consider that *Wilfrid*
was an *Archbishop* not an *Inferiour Clerk*; and if an Appeal from *England*
to *Rome* had been proper or lawful in any Case, it had been so in this Case.
But it was otherwise determined by those who were most concerned.
Malmsbury supposeth, either by *Inspiration*, or upon his own Head, that the
King and the *Arch-bishop Theodore*, were smitten with Remorse before
their Deaths, for the Injury done to *Wilfrid*, and the slighting the *Pope's*
Sentence, Letter, and *Legats*. But the contrary is most apparently true;
for first, It was not *King Alfred* alone, but the great *Council* of the *King-*
dom also; nor *Theodore* alone, but the main Body of the *Clergy*, that op-
posed the *Pope's Letter*, and the Restitution of *Wilfrid* in that manner as it
was decreed at *Rome*. Secondly, after *Alfred* and *Theodore* were both
dead, we find the *Pope's Sentence*, and *Wilfrid's Restitution*, still opposed
by the surviving *Bishops*, in the Reign of *Alfred's Son*. To clear the Matter
past Contradiction, let us consider the ground of this long and bitter Con-
tention;

Ibid. n. 5.
Bed. l. 5. c. 20.Bramhall
Just Vindica-
tion. c. 4. p. 60.Spelman. Con-
sil. An. 705.

"tention; *Wilfrid* the *Archbishop* was become a great *Pluralist*, and had
 "ingrossed into his Hands too many Ecclesiastical Dignities. The *King* and
 "the *Church* of *England* thought fit to deprive him of some of them, and to
 "confer them upon others. *Wilfrid* appealed from their Sentence to
 "Rome. The Pope gave Sentence after Sentence in favour of *Wilfrid*. But
 "for all his Sentences, he was not, he could not be restored, until he had
 "quitted two of his Monasteries which were in Question, *Hongestilldean*
 "and *Ripon*, which of all others he loved most dearly, and where he was af-
 "terwards interred. This was not a Conquest, but a plain waving of his
 "Sentences from *Rome*, and yielding of the *Question*; for those had been
 "the chief Causes of the Controversie. So the *King* and the *Church* after
 "*Alfred's* Death still made good his Conclusion, That it was against Rea-
 "son, that a Person twice condemned by the whole Council of the *English*,
 "should be restored upon the Pope's *Bull*. And as he did not, so neither
 "did they give any assent to the Pope's *Legation*. This I hope may suffice
 as a most sufficient Answer to your Objection from *Wilfrid's* Appeal.

But you would seem to urge yet further for the ancient Subjection of
Britain to the *Church* of *Rome*, in these Words, *Again, is it not manifest out*
of him (Bede), that even the Primitive original Institution of our English
Bishops is from Rome? And for this you cite a Letter of Pope Gregory 1. to
Augustine the Monk, whom you call our *English Apostle*; in which Gregory
 grants to him the use of the *Pall*, the proper Badge or Sign of *Archiepiscopal* Dig-
 nity. and that he condescended, that he should ordain twelve Bishops under his
 Jurisdiction, &c. Behold here, say you, the original Charter, as I may say, of
 the Primacy of *Canterbury*; in this Letter and Mandate of the Pope it is
 founded; nor can it with any colour of Reason be drawn from other Origin. And
 by virtue of this Grant, have all the succeeding Bishops of that See enjoyed the
 Dignity and Authority of *Primates* of this Nation. From whence you very
 civilly charge his Lordship, either with gross Ignorance if he knew it not; or
 with great Ingratitude if he knew it. To which I Answer; that his Lord-
 ship knowing this no doubt very well, that Gregory sent *Austin* into *England*,
 &c. could not from thence think himself bound to submit to the *Roman* Bi-
 shop; and it had been more pertinent to your purpose, not to charge him
 with Ingratitude, but with Disobedience. For that was it which you ought
 to prove hence, that the Archbishop of *Canterbury* ought still to be subject
 to the Bishop of *Rome*, because Gregory 1. made *Augustine* the first Arch-
 bishop of *Canterbury*. A wonderful strong Argument no doubt! which out
 of Charity to you, we must further examine; for you tell us, *The Original*
Charter of the Primacy of Canterbury is contained in that Grant. To satisfy
 you as to this, two things are to be considered, the Primacy it self, and the
 Exercise of it by a particular Person in some particular Place. If you speak
 of the Primacy it self, i. e. the independent Right of Governing the Churches
 within the Provinces of *Britain*, then we utterly deny that this was con-
 tained in that Grant. For *Britain* having been a Province before, in which Bi-
 shops did Govern Independently on any Foreign Bishop, no Foreign Bishops
 could take away that Privilege from it. I will not stand here to deduce
 the History of the Bishops of *Britain*, before *Augustine's* coming into *Eng-*
land; but it is as certain that there were such, as it is that *St. Augustine*
 ever came hither. For not only all our own Historians, and *Bede* himself
 confess it; but it is most evident from the Subscriptions of three of them to
 the first Council of *Arles*, *Eborius* of *York*, *Restitutus* of *London*, and *Adel-*
fus de civitate Colonia Londinensium (which some will have to be a Mistake
 for *Colonia Camaloduni*, whether by that, *Colchester*, *Maldon*, or *Winchester*
 be meant as it is differently thought) from the Presence of some of them at
 the

p. 16.

Bed. l. 1. c. 29.

P. 190.

the *Sardican Synod*, and the *Council of Ariminum*, as appears by *Athanasius* and others; but this I suppose you will not deny, that there were Bishops in *England* before *Austin* came. And, that these Bishops had then no Dependence on the *See of Rome*, if it were not sufficiently evident from other Arguments, the Relation of the Proceedings in *Bede* himself, between *Austin* and them, about Submission, would abundantly discover, as likewise, that there was then an Archbishop with *Metropolitanical Power* over them, whose ancient Seat had been *Caerleon*. But I consider not this Primacy now as in any particular Place, but in general as belonging to the Provinces of *Britain*, which I say had a Primacy belonging to it, (whether at *Tork* or *London* is not material) at the time of the *Council of Nice* (according to what hath been formerly said about the State of Churches then) Now the *Council of Nice* takes care that the Privileges of all Churches should be preserved, i. e. That where there had been a Primacy, it should so continue. Now therefore I ask, How came this Privilege of *Britain* to be lost, which was not only confirmed with others by the *Nicene Council*, but by that of *Chalcedon* and *Ephesus*, in which the ancient Privileges of Churches are secured? What right had *Austin* the Monk to cassate the ancient *Metropolitanical Power* of the *Britannick Church*, and to require absolute Subjection to himself? If the Pope made him Archbishop of *Canterbury*, by what Right was he Primate over the *Britain Church*? How came the Archbishop then in being to lose his Primacy by *Austin's* coming into *England*? Was it because the *Britannick Church* was then over-run with *Pagan Saxons*, and the visible Power of it confined to a narrow Compass? Yet I doubt not, but there were many *British Christians* living here among the *Saxons*, though oppressed by them, as they were after by the *Normans* (for, Where is it that any Conquest hath carried away all the Inhabitants?) and that these did many of them retain their *Christianity*, though not daring publickly to own it, there are many not improbable Circumstances to lead us to suppose. But we will grant that the Face of the *Britannick Church* was only in *Wales*; what follows thence? That the whole Province had lost its Right? Let us suppose a Case like this? As that the Church of *Rome* should be over-run with a Barbarous People (as it was by the *Goths* and *Vandals*) and the Inhabitants destroyed; these Barbarous People continuing in Possession of it, and that a Bishop should have been sent from *Britain* to convert them to the Faith, and upon their Conversion to Govern those Churches, and should be made Bishop of that place by the *British Bishops*, Whether would he be bound to continue always in Subjection to them or no? If not; but you say, by his Succession in the *See of Rome* he enjoys the Privileges of that *See*, though the Inhabitants be altered; the same I say of the *Britannick Churches*, though the Inhabitants were altered, and *Saxons* succeeded the *Britains*, yet the Privilege of the Church remains still as to its Primacy and Independency. And therefore the Pope's making *Augustine* Archbishop, so as to give him withal the Primacy over the Churches in the Province of *Britain*, was an *Usurpation* upon the Rights of our Church, which had an Absolute and Independent Primacy within it self; as it was in the case of the *Cyprian Bishop*. As supposing those ancient Seats of Churches which are over-run with *Turks* should again be converted to *Christianity*, the Bishops of those Churches, as of *Ephesus*, or the like, would enjoy the same Rights which the ancient Bishops had; so we say it was in our case, though the Nation was then over-spread with *Paganism*, yet *Christianity* returning, the Privileges of our Churches did return with it; and whosoever were rightly consecrated Bishops of them, would enjoy the same Rights which they did before. So that *Gregory* might make *Austin* a Bishop, and send him to convert this Nation, by which he was capable to Govern the Churches here

which

which he did convert, but he could not give to him the *Right* over these Churches, which Gregory had no Power over himself; neither could Austin or any other Archbishop of Canterbury give away the Primacy of England by submitting himself to the Roman See. What therefore is Gregory's Grant to Austin, to the Primacy of England? If you ask then, How the Archbishops of Canterbury come to be Primates of England? I Answer, 1. This Primacy must be lodged somewhere; and it is not unalterably fixed to any certain Place, because the Primacy belongs to the Church, and not to a particular See. 2. It is in the Power of Princes to fix the Metropolitan See in what place is judged most convenient; thence have been the frequent Removes of Episcopal and Archiepiscopal Sees; as is evident in many Examples in Ecclesiastical History, particularly in Justiniana Prima, made a Metropolis by Justinian. 3. Where ever the Primacy is lodged, it retains its ancient Privileges; so that there is no need of a Succession of our Archbishops from the British Archbishops of Caerleon to preserve the British Primacy; but that See being removed by the Power of Princes; the Primacy still remains the same, that it was in the British Metropolitans. And thus I hope I have shewn you, that the Original Charter of the Archbishop of Canterbury's Primacy, was not contained in the Pope's grant to Austin.

From hence we proceed again to the Case of the African Churches; for (as his Lordship saith) the African Prelates finding that all succeeding Popes were not of Melchisedech's Temper, set themselves to assert their own Liberties, and held it out stoutly against Zosimus, Boniface 1. and Coelestine 1. who were successively Bishops of Rome. At last, it was concluded in the sixth Council of Carthage, (wherein were assembled two hundred and seventeen Bishops, of which St. Augustine himself was one) that they would not give way to such a manifest Encroachment upon their Rights and Liberties; and thereupon gave present notice to Coelestine to forbear sending his Officers amongst them, lest he should seem to induce the swelling Pride of the World into the Church of Christ. And this is said to have amounted into a formal Separation from the Church of Rome; and to have continued for the space of somewhat more than one hundred Tears. For which his Lordship produceth two publick Instruments extant among the ancient Councils; the one an Epistle from Boniface 2. in whose Time the Reconciliation to Rome is said to be made by Eulalius, then Bishop of Carthage; but the Separation, instigante Diabolo, by the Temptation of the Devil. The other is an exemplar precum, or Copy of the Petition of the same Eulalius, in which he damns and curses all those his Predecessors, which went against the Church of Rome. Now his Lordship urges from hence; Either these Instruments are true, or false. If they be false, then Boniface 2. and his Accomplices at Rome, or some for them are notorious Forgers, and that of Records of great Consequence to the Government and Peace of the whole Church of Christ, and to the perpetual Infamy of that See, and all this foolishly and to no purpose: On the other side, if these Instruments be true; then 'tis manifest that the Church of Africk separated from the Church of Rome; which Separation was either unjust, or just; if unjust then St. Austin, Eugenius, Fulgentius, and all those Bishops and other Martyrs which suffered in the Vandelic Persecution, died in actual and unrepented Schism, and out of the Church; If it were just, then is it far more lawful for the Church of England by a National Council to cast off the Pope's Usurpation, as she did, than it was for the African Church to separate; because then the African Church excepted only against the Pride of Rome in case of Appeals, and two other Canons less material; but the Church of England excepts (besides this grievance) against many Corruptions in Doctrine, with which Rome at that time was not tainted. And St. Austin and those other famous Men durst not thus have separated from Rome, had the Pope had that powerful Principality

Q. 17.
P. 172.

over

P. 191.

over the whole Church of Christ. and that by Christ's own Ordinance and Institution, as A. C. pretends he had. This is the Substance of his Lordship's Discourse, to which we must consider what Answer you return. Which in short is, That you dare not assert the Credit of those two Instruments, but are very willing to think them Forgeries; but you say, the Schismatical Separation of the African Church from the Roman, is inconsistent with the Truth of Story, and confuted by many pregnant and undeniable Instances, which prove that the Africans, notwithstanding the Contest in the sixth Council of Carthage touching matter of Appeals, were always in true Catholick Communion with the Roman Church, even during the Term of this pretended Separation. For which you produce the Testimony of Pope Cælestine concerning St. Austin, the Proceeding of Pope Leo in the case of Lupicinus, the Testimonies of Eugenius, Fulgentius, Gregory, and the presence of some African Bishops at Rome. To all which I answer; that either the African Fathers did persist in the Decree of the Council of Carthage, or they did not; if they did persist in it, and no Separation followed; then the casting off the Usurpations of the Roman See cannot incur the guilt of Schism; for these African Bishops did that, and it seems continued still in the Roman Communion; by which it is evident that the Roman Church was not so far degenerated then as afterwards, or that the Authority of those Persons was so great in the Church, that the Roman Bishops durst not openly break with them, which is a sufficient account of what Cælestine saith concerning St. Austin, that he lived and died in the Communion of the the Roman Church. If you say the Reason why they were in Communion with the Roman Church was, because they did not persist; you must prove it by better Instances than you have here brought; for some of them are sufficient Proofs of the contrary. As appears by the case of Lupicinus an African Bishop appealing to Leo, who indeed was willing enough to receive him; but what of that? Did not the African Bishops of Mauritania Casariensis excommunicate him notwithstanding that Appeal, and ordained another in his Place; and therefore the Pope very fairly sends him back to be tried by the Bishops of his Province. Which Instance, as it argues the Pope's Willingness to have brought up Appeals among them, so it shews the Continuance of their Stoutness in opposing them. And even Pope Gregory so long after, though in his Time the Business of Appeals was much promoted at Rome; yet he dares not challenge them from the Bishops of Africa, but yields to them the Enjoyment of those Privileges which they said they had enjoyed from the Apostles Times. And the Testimonies of Eugenius, and Fulgentius imply nothing of Subjection to Rome, but a Præeminence which that Church had above all others, which it might have without the other; as London may I hope be the Head-City of England, and yet all other Cities not express Subjection to it. But if after that Council of Carthage the Bishops of Rome did by Degrees encroach upon the Liberties of the African Churches, there is this sufficient Account to be given of it; that as the Roman Bishops were always watchful to take Advantages to inhanche their Power, and that especially when other Churches were in a suffering Condition, so a fit Opportunity fell out for them to do it in Africa; For not long after that Council of Carthage, fell out that dismal Persecution of the African Churches, by the Irruption of the Vandals; in which all the Catholick Bishops were banished out of Africa, or lived under great Sufferings; and by a strict Edict of Genfericus, no new Bishops were suffered to be ordained in the Places of the former. This now was a fair Opportunity for the Bishop of Rome to advance his Authority among the suffering Bishops; St. Peter's pretended Successor loving to fish in troubled Waters, and it being faral

Leo. ep. 87. c. 2.

Greg. I. ep. 75.

fatal to Rome from the first Foundation of it, to advance her self by the Ruins of other Places.

But we are call'd off from the Ruins of other Churches, to observe the Methods whereby the Popes grew great under the Emperors which his Lordship gives an Account of from Constantine's time to Charles the Great, about five hundred Years, which begins thus, *So soon as the Emperors became Christian, the Church began to be put in better Order: For the calling and Authority of Bishops over the Inferiour Clergy, that was a thing of known Use and Benefit for Preservation of Unity and Peace in the Church. Which was confessed by S. Hierom himself, and so settled in Mens Minds from the very Infancy of the Church, that it had not been to that time contradicted by any. The only Difficulty then was to accommodate the Places and Precedencies of Bishops, among themselves, for the very necessity of Order and Government. To do this, the most equal and impartial way was, that as the Church is in the Common-wealth, not the Common wealth in it, (as Optatus tells us) So the Honours of the Church should follow the Honours of the State; and so it was insinuated if not ordered (as appears) by the Canons of the Councils of Chalcedon and Antioch. And this was the very Fountain of the Papal Greatness; the Pope having his Residence in the great Imperial City. But Precedency is one thing, and Authority another; It was thought fit therefore, that among Bishops there should be a certain Subordination and Subjection. The Empire therefore being cast into several Divisions (which they call'd Dioceses) every Diocese contained several Provinces, every Province several Bishopricks; The chief of a Diocese was call'd *ἐπίσκοπος*, and sometimes a Patriarch; the chief of a Province, a Metropolitan; next the Bishops in their several Dioceses (as we now use that Word), among these there was effectual Subjection respectively grounded upon Canon, and Positive Law, in their several Quarters; but over them, none at all: All the Difference there, was but Honorary not Authoritative. To all this part of his Lordship's Discourse, you only say, That it is founded upon his own conjectural Presumptions more than upon any thing else; and that you have shewed a far different Fountain of the Pope's Authority from *Tues Petrus*, & *super hanc Petram*, &c. The meaning of what you say, is, That his Lordship's Discourse hath too much Truth and Reason to be Answered solidly; but because it is against the Pope's Interest you defie him, and cross your self, and cry, *Tues Petrus*, &c. and think, this will prevent its doing you any harm. For if we look for one dram of Reason against it, we must look somewhere else than in your Book, though you tell us, You have often evidenced the contrary; but when and where I must profess my self to seek, and I doubt shall continue so to the end of your Book. But his Lordship proceeds. If the Ambition of some particular Persons did attempt now and then to break these Bounds it is no marvel: For no Calling can sanctifie all that have it. And Socrates tells us, that in this Way the Bishops of Alexandria and Rome advanced themselves to a great height ~~and this is~~ *even beyond the quality of Bishops*. Now upon view of Story it will appear, that what Advantage accrewed to Alexandria, was gotten by the violence of Theophilus Patriarch there. A Man of exceeding great Learning and no less Violence; and he made no little Advantage out of this, that the Empress Eudoxia used his help for the casting of St. Chrysostom out of Constantinople. But the Roman Prelates grew by a steady and constant Watchfulness upon all Occasions to increase the Honour of that See. Interposing and assuming to themselves to be Vindices Canonum (as Greg. Naz. speaks) Defenders and Restorers of the Canons of the Church, which was a fair Pretence and took extremly well. But yet the World took notice of this their aim. For in all Contestations between the East and West, which were not small, nor few, the Western Bishops objected Levity to the Eastern; and they again arrogancy to the Bishops of*

P. 193.

the West, as Bilius observes, and upon very warrantable Testimonies. For all this, the Bishop of Rome continued in good Obedience to the Emperor, enduring his Censures and Judgments : and being chosen by the Clergy and People of Rome, he accepted from the Emperor, the Ratification of that Choice. Insomuch, that about the Year 579, when all Italy was on fire with the Lombards, and Pelagius the second constrained through the Necessity of the Times, contrary to the Example of his Predecessors, to enter upon the Popedom without the Emperor's leave, St. Gregory, then a Deacon, was shortly after sent on Embassie to excuse it. To all these things you give one general Answer, by calling them *Impertinencies*, which is a general Name for all that you cannot Answer. The Pope's Obedience to the Emperors you say was constrained, their Ratifications of Pope's Elections only declaring them Canonical, Socrates was a Heretick, the Eastern Bishops partial: This is the Substance of all you say, whereof the two former are manifestly contrary to the Truth of Stories (as, when you desire it may at large be manifested) and the two latter the pitiful Shifts of such who have nothing else to say.

p. 19.

P. 193. n. 9.

But, though you cannot answer Particulars, you can overthrow his whole Design (though you cannot Fiddle, it seems you can conquer Cities, but they must be very weak then.) His main Design, you tell us, is to overthrow the Pope's Supremacy, by shewing, it was not lawful to appeal to Rome; but Catholick Authors (to be sure you are in the Number) frame an unanswerable Argument for his Supremacy, even from the contrary, thus; it was ever held lawful to appeal to Rome in Ecclesiastical Affairs; from all the Parts of Christendom; therefore say they, The Pope must needs be Supreme Judge in Ecclesiastical Matters. This is evidenced out of the 4th and 7th Canons of the Council of Sardica, accounted anciently an Appendix of the Council of Nice, and often cited as the same with it.

Will you give us leave to come near and handle this *unanswerable Argument* a little? for Persons of your Profession use to be very shy of that. But however, since it is exposed to common view, we may take leave to do it. And seriously, upon Consideration of all the Parts and Circumstances of it, I am of your Mind, without flattering you, that it is an *unanswerable Argument*, but quite to another purpose than you brought it for, even against the Pope's Supremacy, as I shall presently discover; so that those Catholick Authors have served you just as Lazarillo did his blind Master, in bidding him leap over the Water, that he might run his Head full butt against the Tree. For that which your best Authors shun as much as may be, and use their best Arts to get besides it, you run blindly, and therefore boldly upon it, as though it were an excellent Argument to your purpose. You say, The Evidence for Appeals, is from the Canons of the Sardican Synod, but if this be an unanswerable Argument for the Pope's Supremacy, 1. How come these Appeals to be pleaded from the Sardican Synod? 2. How come these Appeals to be denied, notwithstanding the Canons of it? The former will prove, that the Supremacy, if granted from hence, was not acknowledged from Divine Right; the latter, that it was not universally acknowledged by the Church after; and therefore both of them will make an *unanswerable Argument* against that which you would prove, viz. the Pope's Supremacy. First, If the Pope's Supremacy be evidenced from hence, 1. How comes it at all to depend on the Canons? 2. Why no sooner than the Canons of Sardica? 3. Why not at all mentioned in them? 1. How comes the Pope's Supremacy, if of Divine Right, to depend at all upon the Canons of the Church? We had thought it had been much more to your purpose, not to have mentioned any Canons at all of the Church about it, but to have produced Evidences, that this was constantly acknowledged as of Divine Institution. But we must bear with

with you, in not producing that which is not to be found. For nothing can be more apparent, than that when the Pope's began to perk up, they pleaded nothing but some *Canons* of the *Church* for what they did, as *Julius* to the *Oriental Bishops*, *Zosimus* to the *African*, and so others. If it had been ever thought then, that this *Supremacy* was of *Divine Right*; What senseless Men were these, to make use of the worst Pleas, and never mention the best? For, supposing they had such a *Supremacy* granted them by the *Canons* of the *Church*, Doth not this imply that their Authority did depend upon the *Churches* grant? and, what the *Church* might give for her own Convenience, she might take it away, when she saw it abused to her apparent Prejudice. And therefore if they had thought that *God* had commanded all *Churches* to be subject to them, it was weakly done of them to plead nothing but the *Canons* of the *Church* for it. 2. Why no sooner than the *Canons* of *Sardica*? Was the *Church* of *Rome* without her *Supremacy* till that time? Will no *Canons* of the *Church* evidence it before them? When this *Council* was not held till eleven Years after the Death of *Constantine*. Had the Pope no right of Appeals till it was decreed here? Yes, *Zosimus* pleads the *Nicene Canons* for it. But upon what Grounds, will appear suddenly. 3. Why is not the Pope's *Supremacy* mentioned as the Ground of these Appeals then? Certainly those *Western Bishops*, who made those *Canons*, should have only recognized the *Divine Right* of the Pope's *Supremacy*; and not made a *Canon* in such a manner as they do, that would make any one be confident they never knew the Pope's *Supremacy*. For their Decree runs thus; *That*

in case any Bishop thought himself unjustly condemned; if it seem good to you, let us honour the Memory of Peter the Apostle, that it be written by those who have judged the Cause, to Julius the Bishop of Rome; and if it seem good, let the Judgment be renewed, and let them appoint such as may take Cognizance of it. Were these Men mad to make such a *Canon* as this, if they believed the Pope's *Supremacy* of *Divine Institution*? What

a dwindling Expression is that, for the *Head of the Church*, to call him *Bishop of Rome* only, when a matter concerning his *Supremacy* is decreeing? And why to *Julius Bishop of Rome*, I pray? Had it not been better to *S. Peter's Successor*, whosoever he be? So it would have been, no doubt, if they had intended a *Divine* or *Universal Right*. And why for the *Honour of S. Peter's Memory*? Had it not been more becoming them to have said, *Out of Obedience to Christ's Commands*, which made him *Head of the Church*? And all this come in with an *ei docet*, if it please you? What, if it please you, Whether the Pope should be *Universal Pastor*, or no? If it please you, Whether the *Church* should be built *super hanc Petram*, or no? If it please you, Whether the *Bishop of Rome* succeeds *S. Peter*, or no? Are these the Men that give such Evidence for the Pope's *Supremacy*? You had better by far never mention them; for if that was the *Lesson* they had to say, never any Boys at *School* said their *Lesson* worse than they do. They wanted such as you among them, to have penned their *Canon* for them; and no doubt it had run in a better strain; For as much as our Lord and Saviour did appoint *S. Peter Head of the Church*, and the *Bishop of Rome* to succeed him as *Christ's Vicar upon Earth*; these are to let you know that he hath an absolute Power by *Divine Right*, over all Persons and Causes, and that Men are bound to obey him upon Pain of eternal Damnation. This had been something like, if you could have found it in some *Canons* of the *Church*; but, to produce a poor sneaking, If it please you, What do you else but betray the Majesty and Grandeur

Εἰ δὲ ἀεὶ τις ἐπισκοπῶν ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ
δοξῇ καὶ ἀκρίβειᾳ — εἰ δὲ καὶ ὑμῶν
τῇ ἀγάπῃ Πέτρος τῷ Ἀποστόλῳ τῇ μνή-
μῃ τιμῶμεν, καὶ γράψωμεν παρὰ τῶ-
ν τῶν κειμένων ἑκαστῶ τῷ Ἐπισκόπῳ
Ρώμῃ, ὅτι, διὰ τὴν γνησίωσαν τὴν ἐπαρ-
χίαν ἐπισκοπῶν, εἰ δὲ καὶ ἀναγνωσθῇ τὸ
δικαίωμα, καὶ ἐπιγινώσκας αὐτὸς πα-
ράχρη. Concil. Sardic. c. 3.

of your Church? And yet after all this, no such thing as absolute Appeals to Rome are decreed here neither, but only that the Bishop of Rome should have Power to review the case; and in case it was thought necessary, that other Persons should be appointed to examine it. But, How much a Review differs from an Appeal, and that nothing but a Power to review cases is here given to the Bishop of Rome; are fully manifested by *Petrus de Marca*, to whom I again refer you. So that we see from hence you have very comfortable Evidence for the Pope's Supremacy.

De Concord.
facerd. & Imp.
1. 7. c. 3. sect.
6, 7. &c.
1. 7. c. 4. sect. 2.

¶ 20.

Concord. Ca-
thol. 1. 2. c. 15.

Aug. ep. 163.

Contra Cresc.

1. 3. c. 34.
1. 4. c. 44.

P. 195.

2. Suppose it had been decreed here, you had not gained much by it; Because, notwithstanding this Decree, it was far from being acknowledged by the Universal Church. Which I prove from hence, That the Sardican Canons were not received by the Church: Nothing can be more evident, than that these Canons were not so much as known by the African Bishops, when Pope *Zosimus* fraudulently sent them under the Name of the Nicene Canons; insomuch that *Cusanus* questions, Whether ever any such thing were determined by the Sardican Synod or no: And it appears by *S. Austin*, that the Council of Sardica was of no great credit in Africa; for when *Fortunius* the Donatist Bishop would prove, that the Sardican Synod had written to some of their Party, because one *Donatus* was mentioned in it; *S. Austin* tells him, It was a Synod of *Arrians*; by which it seems very improbable, that they had ever received the Decrees of the Western, but only of the Eastern part of it, which adjourned to *Philippopolis*. Neither was this ever acknowledged for an Oecumenical Council, for although it was intended for such by the Emperors, *Constans*, and *Constantius*, yet but 70. of the Eastern Bishops appeared to 300. of the Western; and those Eastern Bishops soon withdrew from the other, and decreed things directly contrary to the other. So that *Balsamon* and *Zonaras*, as well as the elder Greeks, say, The Decrees of it can at most only bind the Western Churches; and the arrogating of this Power of reviewing Causes decided by the Eastern Churches by Western Bishops, was apparently the Cause of the Divisions between them; the Eastern and Western Churches being after this divided by the *Alpes Sueciæ*, between *Illyricum* and *Thracia*. And, although *Hilary* and *Epiphanius* expressly call this a Western Council, yet it was a long time, before the Canons of it were received in the Western Church. Which is supposed to be the Reason, Why *Zosimus* would not mention the Sardican, but called them the Nicene Canons; which Forgery was sufficiently detected by the African Bishops. And it is the worst of all Excuses, to lay the Blame of it (as you do) on the Pope's Secretary; for, Do you think Pope *Zosimus* was so careless of his Business, as not to look over the *Commonitorium*, which *Faustinus* carried with him? Do you think *Faustinus* would not have corrected the Fault when the African Bishops boggled so at it? What made him so unwilling that they should send into the East to examine the Nicene Canons, but intreated them to leave the business wholly with the Pope, if he were not conscious of some Forgery in the Business? But, you say, as a further Plea in *Zosimus*'s Excuse, That the Council of Sardica was an Appendix to the Nicene Council rather than otherwise. An excellent Appendix, made at two and twenty Years distance from the other, and called by other Emperors, consisting of many other Persons, and assembled upon a quite different Occasion. If this had been an Appendix to the Nicene Council. How comes that to have but twenty Canons? How came *Atticus* and *Cyrillus* not to send these with the other? How come all the Copies of Councils and Canons to distinguish them? How came they not to be contained in the Code of Canons, produced in the Council of Chalcedon, in the cause of *Bassianus* and *Stephanus*?

Stephanus ? If this were the same Council, because some of the same things were determined. How comes that in *Trullo* not to be the same with the 6 *Oecumenical* ? How comes the Council of *Antioch* not to be an *Appendix* to the Council of *Nice*, if this was, when it was celebrated before this, and the *Canons* of it inserted in the *Code of Canons* owned by the Council of *Chalcedon* ? So that by all the Shifts and Arts you can use, you cannot excuse *Zosimus* from *Imposture* in sending these *Sardican* under the Name of the *Nicene Canons*. And, on what Account the *Pope* falsified the *Canons* then, is apparent enough, viz. for the advancing the *Interest* of his *See* ; and this the *African Fathers* did as easily discern afterwards, as we do now. But by this we see, What good *Foundations* the *Pope's* Claim of *Supremacy* had then, and what *Arts* (not to say *Frauds*) they were beholding to for setting it up, even as great as they have since made use of to maintain it.

D.

106: 1: c

C H A P. VI.

Of the Title of Universal Bishop.

In what Sense the Title of Universal Bishop was taken in Antiquity. A three-fold Acceptation of it ; as importing 1. A general Care over the Christian Churches, which is attributed to other Catholick Bishops by Antiquity, besides the Bishop of Rome, as is largely proved. 2. A peculiar Dignity over the Churches within the Roman Empire. This accounted then Oecumenical, thence the Bishops of the seat of the Empire called Oecumenical Bishops : and sometimes of other Patriarchal Churches. 3. Noting Universal Jurisdiction over the whole Church as Head of it, so never given in Antiquity to the Bishop of Rome. The ground of the Contest about this Title between the Bishops of Rome and Constantinople: Of the Proceedings, of the Council of Chalcedon, about the Pope's Supremacy. Of the Grammatical and Metaphorical Sense of this Title. Many Arguments to prove it impossible that S. Gregory should understand it in the Grammatical Sense. The great Absurdities consequent upon it. S. Gregory's Reasons proved to hold against that Sense of it which is admitted in the Church of Rome. Of Irenæus his Opposition to Victor. Victor's excommunicating the Asian Bishops, argues no Authority he had over them. What the more powerful Principality in Irenæus is. Ruffinus his Interpretation of the 6. Nicene Canon vindicated. The Suburbicary Churches cannot be understood of all the Churches in the Roman Empire. The Pope no Infallible Successour of S. Peter, nor so acknowledged to be by Epiphanius. S. Peter had no Supremacy of Power over the Apostles.

HIS Lordship having undertaken to give an Account, How the Popes rose by degrees to their Greatness under the Christian Emperours ; in prosecution of that, necessarily falls upon the Title of *Universal Bishop* affected by *John* the Patriarch of *Constantinople*, and condemned by *Pelagius II.* and *Gregory I.* This you call a *trite and beaten way*, because I suppose the Truth is so plain and evident in it ; but withal, you tell us, *This Objection hath been satisfied a hundred times over* ; if you had said, the same Answer had been repeated so often over, you had said true ; but if you say, that it hath been *satisfied once*, you say more than you are able to defend, as will evidently appear by your very unsatisfactory Answer, which at last you give to it. So that if none of your Party have been any wiser than your

p. 1.

your self in this matter ; I am so far from being *satisfied* with what they say, that I can only pity those Persons, whose Interest sways their Understandings so much (or at least their Expressions) as to make them say any thing that seems to be for their Purpose, though in it self never so senseless or unreasonable. And I can scarce hold my self from saying with the *Orator*, when a like Objection to this was offered him, because Multitudes had said so, *Quasi verò quidquam sit tam valde, quàm nihil sapere, vulgare*, That Truth and Reason are the greatest *Novelties* in the World. For seriously, Were it possible for Men of common Understanding, to rest satisfied with such pitiful Shifts as you are fain to make, if they would but use any Freedom in enquiring, and any Liberty of judging when they had done ? But when once Men have given (not to say sold away) the exercise of their free Reason, by addicting themselves to a particular Interest, there can scarce any thing be imagined so absurd, but it passeth currently from one to another, because they are bound to receive all blindfold, and in the same manner to deliver it to others. By which means it is an easie matter, for the greatest Nonsense and Contradictions *to be said a hundred times over*. And, Whether it be not so in the present case, is that we are now to enquire into. And for the same Ends which you propose to your self, *viz. that all Obscurity may be taken away, and the Truth clearly appear* ; I shall in the first Place set down, What his Lordship saith, and then distinctly examine What you reply in Answer to it. Thus then his Lordship proceeds. *About this Time brake out the Ambition of John Patriarch of Constantinople, affecting to be Universal Bishop. He was countenanced in this by Mauricius the Emperor, but sowrely opposed by Pelagius and S. Gregory : Insomuch that S. Gregory plainly says, That this Pride of his shews that the Times of Antichrist were near. So as yet (and this was near upon the point of six hundred Years after Christ) there was no Universal Bishop : no one Monarch over the whole Militant Church. But Mauricius being deposed and murthered by Phocas ; Phocas conferred upon Boniface the Third, that very Honour which two of his Predecessors had declaimed against as monstrous and blasphemous, if not Antichristian. Where, by the way, either these two Popes, Pelagius and S. Gregory erred in this weighty Business, about an Universal Bishop over the whole Church : Or, if they did not err, Boniface and the rest, which after him took it upon them, were in their very Predecessors Judgment Antichristian.*

P. 178. *Before you come to a particular Answer, you think it necessary to make a way for it, by premising two Things. 1. That the Title of Universal Bishop, was anciently attributed to the Bishops of Rome ; but they never made use of it. 2. That the ancient Bishops of Constantinople never intended by this usurped Title, to deny the Pope's Universal Authority, even over themselves. These two things I shall therefore consider, because they tend much to the clearing the main Controversie. I begin therefore with the Title of Universal Bishop, attributed to the Bishop of Rome ; and before I answer your particular Allegations, we must more fully consider, in what Sense that Title of Universal Bishop was taken in Antiquity, and in what manner it was attributed to him. For when Titles have different Senses, and those senses evidently made use of by the ancient Writers, it is a most unreasonable thing meerly from the Title to infer one determinate Sense, which is the most contrary to the current of Antiquity. The Title then of Universal Bishop, may be conceived to import one of these three Things. 1. A general Care and Solitude over all the Churches of the Christian World. 2. A peculiar Dignity over the Churches within the Empire. 3. Universal Jurisdiction over all Churches, so that all exercise of it in the Church is derivative from him as Universal Pastor and Head of the Church. This last is that which you attribute to*

L. 4 ep. 78.

P. 196. n. 1, 2.

Pope; and though you find the name of *Universal Bishop* a hundred Times over, in the Records of the Church, yet if it be taken in either of the two former Senses, it makes nothing at all to your purpose. Our Business is therefore now, to shew, that this Title was used in the Church in the two former Senses; and that nothing from hence can be inferred for that *Oecumenical Pastorship*, which you say, doth, of Divine Right, belong to the Bishop of Rome.

I begin with the *first*, as this Title may import a *general Care and Solitude over all the Christian Churches*: and I deny not but in this Sense this Title might be attributed in *Antiquity* to the Bishop of Rome; but then I assert, that nothing peculiar to him can be inferred from hence, because Expressions importing the same care, are attributed to other Bishops, especially such who were placed in the greater *Sees*, or were active in promoting the Church's Interest. For which we must consider, that Power and Authority in the Bishops of the Church, is given with an immediate respect to the good of the *whole Church*; so that if it were possible that every particular Bishop could take care of the *whole Church*, they have Authority enough by their *Function* to do it. But it not only being impossible that every Bishop should do it, but it being inconsistent with Peace and Order, that all should undertake it; therefore it was necessary that there should be some Restraints and Bounds set, for the more convenient Management of that Authority which they had. From hence came the *Original* of particular *Dioceses*, that within such a Compass they might better exercise that Power which they enjoyed. As if many Lights be placed in a great Room, though the Intention of every one of these is to give Light to the *whole Room*; yet that this might the better be done, these Lights are conveniently placed in the several Parts of it. And this is that which S. Cyprian means in that famous Expression of his, *That there is but one Bishoprick in the whole World, a part of which is held by every Bishop*; For the Church in common is designed as the Diocese of all Bishops, which is set out into several *Appartments* for the more advantageous governing of it. As a Flock of many thousand Sheep, being committed to the care of many Shepherds, these all have an Eye to the good of the *whole Flock*, but do not therefore sit all together in one Place to over-see it, but every one hath his Share to look after, for the benefit of the *Whole*: But yet so, that upon occasion, one of them may extend his Care beyond his own Division, and may be very useful for the whole, by Counsel and Direction. Thus we shall find it was in the *Primitive Church*; though every Bishop had his particular *Charge*, yet still they regarded the common Good of the whole Church, and upon Occasion did extend their Counsel and Advice far beyond their particular Churches; and exercised their Functions in other Places besides those, which the Church's Convenience had allotted to them. Hence it was, that Dissensions arising between the *Asian* and *Roman Churches*, Polycarp comes to Rome, and there, as Eusebius from Irenæus tells us, He exercised with Anicetus his Consent, his Episcopal Function. For, as Valeſius observes, it cannot be understood, as Franciscus Florens would have it, of his receiving the Eucharist from Anicetus, but something of Honour is implied in the Word *παρεχω'ενον*, whereas there was nothing but what was common in the other. Hence the several Epistles of Ignatius, Polycarp, Irenæus, and others, for the advising, confirming, and settling Churches. Hence Irenæus concerned himself so much in the Business between Victor and the *Asian Churches*, either to prevent, or repeal his Sentence of Excommunication against them. Hence S. Cyprian writes into Spain about the deposing Baslides and Martialis, two Apostatizing Bishops, and checks Stephen Bishop of Rome, for his inconsiderate restoring them. Hence, Faustus Bishop of Lyons writes to S. Cyprian,

p. 2.

Euseb. l. 5.
cap. 24.
Not. in l.

Euseb. l. 4 c. 25.

Cyprian. ep. 68.

Cyprian. ep. 67.

prian, in the case of *Martianus* of *Arles*, and he writes to *Stephen*, as being nearer, and more concerned in the Business of *Novatianism* (for the Honour of his Predecessors) in order to his Deposition; yet so, as he looks on it as a common Cause belonging to them all (*cui rei nostrum est consulere & subvenire, frater charissime* in which they were all bound to advise and help. Hence *S. Cyprian* writes to the Bishop of *Rome*, as his Brother and Colleague, without the least Intimation of deriving any Jurisdiction from him, but often expressing that Charge which was committed to every Bishop, which he must look to as mindful of the Account he must give to God. Hence *Nazianzen* saith of *S. Cyprian*, That he not only governed the Churches of *Carthage* and *Africa*, but all the Western Parts, and even almost all the Eastern, Southern, and Northern too, as far as his Fame went. Hence *Arsenius* writes to *Athanasius*, We embrace Peace and Unity with the Catholick Church, over which thou, through the Grace of God, dost preside. Hence *Gregory Nazianzen* saith of *Athanasius*, That he made Laws for the whole Earth. Hence *S. Basil* writes to him, That he had care of all the Churches, as of his own; and in the same Epistle calls him, The Head and chief over all. Hence *S. Chrysostom* in the praise of *Eustathius* the Patriarch of *Antioch*, saith, That he was instructed by the Divine Spirit, that he was not only to have care of that Church over which he was set, but of the whole Church throughout the World. Hence came the great Endeavours of *Theophilus* and *Cyril*, Patriarchs of *Alexandria*, of *Eusebius Vercellensis*, *Hilarius Pictaviensis*, and several others, for rooting out of Heresies; not confining themselves to those Provinces allotted to them, but extending their care over other Churches. Hence came frequent Ordinations of Persons out of their own Dioceses, as of *Paulinus* at *Antioch* by *Lucifer Calaritanus*, of many Bishops in *Syria* and *Mesopotamia* by *Eusebius Samosatenus*; and of a Presbyter at *Bethleem* by *Epiphanius*; who when he was quarrelled at by *John* of *Hierusalem* for it, he defends his Action by his saying, That, *In Sacerdotio Dei nulla est diversitas, i. e.* whete-ever a Bishop was, he might exercise his Power as such, although the Churches Prudence had set Limits to their ordinary Jurisdiction. From these Things then we see, that a general Care and Solitude of the Universal Church, doth belong to every Bishop, and that some of them have been expressly said to have had the care of the whole Church, which in other Terms is to say, They were Universal Bishops. So that from this Sense of the Title, you gain nothing to your purpose, though the care of the Universal Church be attributed to the Bishop of *Rome*, though he acts and calls Councils, and orders other things out of his own Province, yet all this proves not the Supremacy you intend; for this is no more than other Bishops did, whom you will not acknowledge to be Heads of the Church, or Universal Bishops in that Sense.

§. 3.

2. An Universal Bishop denotes a peculiar Dignity over the Churches within the Roman Empire: For which, two things will be sufficient to manifest it. 1. That the Roman Empire was then accounted Universal. 2. That some Bishops in the Great Churches, were on that account called Oecumenical or Universal Bishops. 1. That the Roman Empire was then accounted Universal; for which Multitudes of Testimonies might be cited, in which *orbis Romanus*, and *orbis Humanus* were looked on as Synonymous; thence *Trebellius Pollio* in *Macrianus*, *qui ex diversis partibus orbis Romani restituant*; and as *Salmasius* witnesseth in those Writers of the Imperial History; most of the ancient MSS. for *orbis Romanus* have *orbis Humanus*; for, as he saith, *Ea gloria fuerunt Romani, ut totum orbem suum vocarent; hinc orbis Romanus passim apud auctores reperitur pro universo orbe*; thence they called the Roman People, *Omnium gentium victorem*; and from hence *Amma-*

Nazian. Orat.
18 p. 281.

Athanas. Ap.
ad Imp. Conf.
p. 786. *Tom. 1.*
Nazianz.
Orat. 21.
p. 392.
Basil. ep. 52.
Tom. 3. p. 79.
Chrysost.
Tom. 5. p. 631.
ed. Savil.

Hieron. ep. 71.
Ruffin. l. 11.
c. 27, 30, 31.

Theodoret. l. 5.
c. 4.

Hieron. ep. 60.

Not. in Hist.
August. p. 306.

nus Marcellinus calls Rome, *caput Mundi* (the head of the World) and the Roman Senate, *Afylum mundi totius* (the Sanctuary for the whole World;) thence Spartianus faith of Severus, *orbem terrarum Romanque despexit*, when as Casaubon observes, he speaks only of the Roman Provinces. And from hence, whatever was out of the Roman Empire, was called *Barbaria*, thence the *rura vicina Barbariæ* in Lampridius, for the Marches which lay next to the Enemies Country: thence Marcellinus, *visus est in Barbarico miles*, and in the Imperial Constitutions, as Justellus observes, *Barbari vocantur, qui cunque Imperio Romano non parebant* (all were called barbarous out of the Roman Empire) and in the same Sense *barbaricum* is used in the 58th. Canon of the African Code, and in the 206th. Canon of the Code of the Universal Church, that the Bishops *ἐκ τοῦ βασιλείου, i. e. out of the Roman Empire*, should be ordained by the Patriarch of Constantinople. Now, since the Roman Empire was called *orbis Romanus*, and in Greek, *ὁ οἰκουμένη*, (as appears, in that Augustus, Luk. 2. 1. is said to tax *πάντας τοὺς οἰκουμένῃν*, the whole World, which could be only the Roman Empire; and the famine in the same, is said to be *ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ οἰκουμένῃ*, Act. 11. 28.) it is no wonder if those Bishops who enjoyed the greatest Dignity in the Roman Empire were called *Oecumenical*; and those Councils so too, which consisted of the Bishops within those Bounds. I come therefore to the second thing, That some Bishops in the Great Churches in the Roman Empire, were called *Oecumenical*, as that relates to the *ὁ οἰκουμένη*, viz. the Roman Empire. For which we may consider, the primary Ground of the Advancement of the Patriarch of Constantinople, was the greatness of the City, as is undeniably manifest by the Proceedings of the Councils of Constantinople, and Chalcedon about him; wherein it was decreed, since that was New-Rome, that it should enjoy equal Privileges with the old. And in all Probability the Ground of the Patriarch of Constantinople's usurping the Title of *Oecumenical Patriarch* was but to correspond with the Greatness of his City, which at the Time of the Contest between Pope Gregory, and him, was in a better Condition than Rome itself; being the Seat of the Empire, and therefore he thought it suitable thereto, to be called *Oecumenical Patriarch*. But besides this Peculiarity of Constantinople, it was no unusual thing for the Bishop of the Patriarchal Churches, to have Expressions given them, tantamount to the Title of *Universal Bishop* in any Sense but that of the *Universal Jurisdiction*; which I shall prove as to the three Patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch, and Constantinople. First, Of Alexandria: So Greg. Nazianzen faith of Athanasius, being made Bishop there, he had the Government of that People committed to him, which is as much as to say, of the whole World; and John of Hierusalem, writing to Theophilus Patriarch of Alexandria, faith, That he had the care of all the Churches. And St. Basil writes to Athanasius about the establishing of Meletius as Patriarch of Antioch, that so he might govern as it were the whole Body of the Church. But most clear and full to that purpose is the Testimony of Theodoret concerning Nestorius being made Patriarch of Constantinople. He was intrusted with the Government of the Catholick Church of the Orthodox at Constantinople, and thereby of the whole World. What work would you make with so illustrious a Testimony in Antiquity for the Bishop of Rome as this is for the Patriarch of Constantinople? Use therefore and interpret but these Testimonies as kindly as you do any for the

Ann. Marcell.
 1. 14. l. 16.

Spartian. in
 Severo.

Lamprid. in
 Alex. Sev.
 Marcell. l. 18.
 Justel. Not.
 in Cod. Afric.
 Can. 58.

Cod. Eccles.
 Uni. Can. 26.
 ibi Justel.

Τὴν τῇ λαῷ παρεδωκέναν πνευματικὴν, τὴν
 ὅλην ὡς αὐτὴν τῆς οἰκουμένης πᾶσι καὶ ἐκτελεστέαν
 αὐτῷ. Nazianzen. 21. p. 377.

Tu quidem ut homo Dei & Apostolicæ orna-
 tus gratiâ curam omnium Ecclesiarum sus-
 stines. Apud Hieronym. ad Pammach.
 To. 2. ep. 61. c. 15.

Καὶ τὸ τῷ πᾶσι, ὡς εἰπὼν, σὺ μὲν ὅλην
 τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἀντὶ τοῦ πρεσβεῖναι. Basil. ep.
 50.

Τῆς κατὰ Κωνσταντινὸν καὶ ὁμοῦ καὶ
 καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας τὸν παρεδωκέναν πνευ-
 ματικὴν, ὅλην ὡς ὅλην καὶ τῆς οἰκουμένης
 ἀπὸ αὐτοῦ. Theodoret. hæret. fabul. l. 4.
 c. 12. p. 245. To. 4. oper.

the *Roman See*, and will you not find as large a Power over the Church attributed to the other *Patriarchs* as you do to the Bishop of Rome? What is it then you would infer from the Title of *Universal Bishop* being attributed to him? Will the very Title do more than what is signified by it? Or must it of Necessity import something more when given to the Bishop of Rome than it doth when given to other Bishops? If it doth, you must prove it from some other Arguments, and not barely from the Title being attributed to them. Thus you see, though the Title were granted to be attributed to him, there is nothing new, nothing peculiar in it.

d. 4.
p. 196.

But we must further examine, Who they are that attribute this Title to him, and what the Account is of their doing it. For this, you cite the Council of Chalcedon in a Letter inserted in the Acts of it, the Council of Constantinople sub Menna, John Bishop of Nicopolis, Constantinus Pogonatus the Emperour, Basil the younger, and Balsamon himself. To the first I Answer, 1. That this Title was not given by the Council of Chalcedon. 2. If it had, no more was given to the Bishop of Rome, than to the Bishops of other Patriarchal Churches. 1. That this Title was not given by the General Council of Chalcedon; this I know Gregory I. in his Epistles about this Subject, repeats *usque ad nauseam*, That the Title of Universal Bishop was offered to the Bishop of Rome by the Council of Chalcedon and that he refused it; but there is as little Evidence for the one as the other. That the Title of Oecumenical Patriarch was attributed to the Bishop of Rome by some Papers read and received in that Council, I deny not, but we must consider the Persons who did it, and the occasion of it. The Persons were such who

Concil. Chalced.
Act. 3. part. 3.
p. 243.

came to inform the Council against Dioscorus the Patriarch of Alexandria, and they were no other than Athanasius, a Presbyter, Theodorus and Ischyrius two Deacons, and Sophronius a Laick of Alexandria: Now these Persons not in a Letter (as you relate it) but in their Bills exhibited to the Council against Dioscorus give that Title of Oecumenical Patriarch or Archbishop to Leo the Bishop of Rome. And is this now the Offer made of the Title of Universal Bishop by the Council of Chalcedon? But you say, This was inserted into the Acts of the Council? I grant it was, but on what Account? Not with any respect to the Title, but as containing the Accusations against Dioscorus. But where do any of the Bishops of that Council attribute that Title to Leo? Which of them mentions it in their Subscriptions to the Deposition of Dioscorus, tho' many of them speak expressly of Leo and Anatolius together with the same Titles of Honour to them both? Why did not the Council superscribe their Synodical Epistle to Pope Leo with that Title? So indeed Binius rather supposes they should have done, than proves they ever did it? And that only from Gregory's Epistle (not Leo's as he mistakes it) to Eulogius where he mentions this Offer, but upon what Grounds we have seen already. But suppose, 2. We should grant, that the Council of Chalcedon should have offered the Title of Oecumenical Patriarch or Bishop, to the Bishop of Rome; there are none who understand any Thing of the Nature of that Title, or the Proceedings of that Council, who can imagine they should intend any Acknowledgment of the Pope's Supremacy by it. For the Title it self as to the Importance of it was common to other Bishops, especially of the Patriarchal Sees, as I have proved by some Instances already, and might do yet by more; but I shall content my self with the

Bin. not. in
Chalced. Con
Tom. 3. Concil.
p. 562.

Et harum rerum ignari Audaces nostri, non advertunt, cum Occidentales Patres, Pontifices Romanos vocant, universales Ecclesia

ingenious Confession of Sim. Vigorius; That when the Western Fathers, call the Roman Bishops, Bishops of the Universal Church, they do it from the Custom of their

their Churches, not that they look on them as Universal Bishops of the whole Church, but in the same Sense that the Patriarchs of Constantinople, Antioch, Alexandria, Jerusalem, are called so; or as they are Universal over the Churches under their Patriarchate; or that in Oecumenical Councils they preside over the whole Church. And after acknowledgeth, that the Title of Universal or Oecumenical Bishop makes nothing for the Pope's Monarchy in the Church. And if it doth not so when given by the Western Fathers, much less certainly when given by the Eastern, especially those who met in the Council of Chalcedon; For it is evident by their 16 Session, the 28 Canon, and their Synodical Epistle to Pope Leo, they designed the Advancement of the See of Constantinople to equal Privileges with that of Rome. And therefore if they gave the Pope the Title of Oecumenical Patriarch, or Bishop, it was that he might be willing that the Patriarch of Constantinople might be called so too. And if, as Gregory saith, the Bishops of Rome would not accept the Title of Universal Bishop, the truest account I know of it, is, lest the Patriarch of Constantinople should share with him in it; but we see when the great Benefactor to your Church, the Benign Phocas, as Gregory himself styles him, gave it to the Bishop of Rome alone, then Hands and Heart, and all were ready to receive it. And I much fear Leo 1. and St. Gregory himself would have been shrewdly tempted to receive it, if it had been offered them upon those Terms, that no one else should have it besides them; but they scorned it till they could have it alone. And for all their Declamations against the Pride of Anatolius and John, Patriarchs of Constantinople, they must look very favourably on the Actions of those two Popes, that discern not their own Pride in condemning of them for it. For usually Men shew it as much in suspecting or condemning others for it, as in any other way whatsoever. Thus it was in these Persons; they thought the Patriarchs of Constantinople proud and arrogant, because they sought to be equal with them. But, Was it not their own greater Pride, that they were able to bear no Equals? and it is to be feared, it was their Desire to advance their own Supremacy, which made them quarrel so much with Anatolius, and John, and Cyriacus. For would they but have been contented to truckle under the Roman Bishops they had been accounted very meek and humble Men. And St. Gregory himself, would not sure have thought much to have called them so, who most abominably flatters that Monster Phocas, after the Murder of Mauricius and his Children: for he begins his Epistle to him with, *Gloria in excelsis Deo*: *Greg. l. ii. ep. 36. Ind. 6.* Glory to God on high, who, according to what is written, changes Times and transfers Kingdoms: and after, in such notorious flattering Expressions congratulates his coming to the Throne, that any one who reads them would think Phocas the greater Saint; he rejoices, that the Benignity of his Piety was advanced to the Imperial Throne, nay (*lætentur cœli & exulter terra*) let the Heavens rejoyce and the Earth be glad, and all the People which have been hitherto in much Affliction, revive at the Benignity of your Actions. O rare Phocas! Could he do any less than pronounce the Bishop of Rome Universal Bishop after this, when poor Cyriacus at Constantinople suffered for his opposing him for the Execrable Murder of his Master? Therefore these Proceedings of Leo and Gregory yield shrewd Matter of Suspicion, what the main Ground of their Quarrel against the Patriarchs of Constantinople was. For before, the Emperors stood up for the Honour of Constantinople, as being the Seat of their Empire, and Rome began to sink, the Em-

pire decaying there; but now, there was a fit time to do something for the Honour of the Roman See; Cyriacus was in Disgrace with the Tyrant Phocas; and no such time as now to fall in with him and caress him; and we see Gregory did it pretty well for a Saint, but he lived not to enjoy the Benefit of it; but Boniface did however.

¶ 5.

After the Patriarchate of Constantinople was erected, the Popes had a double Game to play, to advance themselves, and depress that, which it was very hard for them to do, because all the Eastern Bishops, as well as the Emperour favoured it. But after equal Privileges were decreed to the Patriarch of Constantinople with the Bishop of Rome, by the Council of Constantinople, they could no longer dissemble their Choler; but had no such occasion ministred to them to express it as after the Canon of the Council of Chalcedon, (wherein were present 630 Bishops) which confirmed the former. For then Leo fumes and frets and writes to Martianus, and Pulcheria, to Anatolius and the Bishops of the East; but still pretends that he stood up for the Privileges of the other Patriarchs and the Nicene Canons, and what not? But one might easily discern what it was that pinched him, viz. the equalling the Patriarch of Constantinople with himself. Which it is apparent he suspected before, by the Instructions he gave his Legats Paschasinus and Lucentius, to be sure to oppose whatever was proposed in the Council concerning the Primacy of that See. And accordingly they did; and complained that the Canon was surreptitiously made. Which they were hugely overseen in doing while the Council sat, for upon this the whole matter is reviewed, the Judges scan the Business, the Bishops protest there were no Practices used; that they all voluntarily contented to it; and all this in the Presence of the Roman Legats? How comes it then to pass that this should not be a regular and conciliar Action? Were not the Bishops at Age to understand their own Privileges? Did not the Bishop of Antioch know his own Interest as well as Pope Leo? Must he be supposed more able to understand the Nicene Canons than these 630 Bishops? Why then was not this Canon as regular as any other? Why forsooth, The Pope did not consent to it. So true is that sharp Censure of

Itaque illa demum eis videntur edita & concilia quæ in rem suam faciunt, reliqua non pluris stimanda quam conventum muliercularum in textrina vel thermis. Lud. Vives in Aug. de Civit. Dei l. 20. cap. 26.

Ludovicus Vives, that, those are accounted lawful Canons and Councils which make for their Interest, but others are no more esteemed than a Company of tatling Gossips. But what made the Pope so angry at this Canon of the Council of Chalcedon? He pretends the

B. n. not. in Chalced. Con. p. 561.

Honour of the Nicene Canons, the preserving the Privileges of other Patriarchs; But Binius hath told us the true Reason of it; because, they say, that the Primacy of Rome came, by its being the seat of the Empire; and therefore not by Divine right; and since Constantinople was become the Seat of the Empire too, therefore the Patriarch there should enjoy equal Privileges with the Bishop of Rome. If Rome had continued still the sole Seat of the Empire, this Reason would not have been quarrelled at; but now Rome sinking and Constantinople rising, this must not be endured; but all the Arts and Devices possible must be used to keep it under. And this is the true Account of the Pique which the Bishops of Rome had to the Patriarchs of Constantinople: From whence we may easily guess how probable it is that this Council of Chalcedon did acknowledge the Pope Oecumenical Bishop in any other Sense than they contended the Patriarch of Constantinople was so too. And the same Answer will serve for all your following Instances. For, as you pretend that the Council of Constantinople sub Menna did call Pope Agapetus Oecumenical Patriarch, so it is most certain that it call'd

Mennas

Meenas the Patriarch of Constantinople so too. And which is more, Adrian 1. in his Epistle to Tharastus of Constantinople in the second Nicene Council, calls him *Universal Bishop*. If therefore the Greek Emperors and Balsamon call the Pope so, they import nothing peculiar to him in it, because it is most evident they call'd their own Patriarch so likewise. So that you find little Advantage to your Cause from this first thing which you premise, viz. that the Pope was anciently called *Universal Bishop*. But you say further. 2. *That the Bishops of Constantinople never intended to deny by this usurped Title, the Pope's Universal Authority even over themselves.* This is ambiguous, unless it be further explained what you mean by *Universal Authority*; for, it may either note some kind of *Præ-eminence* and *Dignity* which the Bishop of Rome had as the chief Patriarch, and who on that account had great *Authority* in the Church, and this your Instances prove, that the Patriarchs of Constantinople did acknowledge to belong to the Pope: but if by *Universal Authority* be meant *Universal Jurisdiction over the Church, as appointed the Head of it by Christ*, then not one of your Instances comes near the Shadow of a Proof for it.

P. 196. n. 1.

Thus having considered what you premise, we come to your Answer it self. For which you tell us, *We are to take notice, that the Term [Universal Bishop] is capable of two Senses; the one Grammatical, the other Metaphorical. In the Grammatical Sense it signifies Bishop of the Universal Church, and of all Churches in particular, even to the Exclusion of all others from being properly Bishops; and consequently displaceable at his Pleasure; as being only his, not Christ's Officers; and receiving Authority from him, and not from Christ. In the Metaphorical Sense, it signifies only so high and eminent a Dignity above all other Bishops throughout the whole Church, that though he, who is stiled Universal Bishop, hath a true and real Superintendency, Jurisdiction, and Authority over all other Bishops, yet that they be as truly and properly Bishops in their respective Provinces and Dioceses as he himself.* This being cleared (say you) 'tis evident that St. Gregory when he inveighs against the Title of *Universal Bishop*, takes it in the *Literal and Grammatical Sense*; which you very faintly endeavour to prove out of him, as I shall make it presently appear. This being then the Substance of that Answer which you say hath been given a hundred times over, must now once for all pass a strict and severe Examination. Which it shall receive in these two Enquiries, 1. Whether it be possible to conceive that St. Gregory should take *Universal Bishop* in the *Literal and Grammatical Sense* which you give of it? And he which can think so, must have some other way of understanding his meaning than by his Words and Arguments, which I confess I do not pretend to. But if we examine them, we shall find how impossible it is that St. Gregory should ever think that John pretended to be the sole Bishop of this World. 1. Because Gregory saith, *That same Title which John had usurped was offered to the Roman Bishops by the Council of Chalcedon, but none of them would ever use it, because it seemed to diminish the Honour of other Bishops.* Now I pray think with your self, whether ever 630 Bishops would consent together to give away all their Power and Authority in the Church? For you say, *The Literal Sense of Universal Bishop doth suppose him to be Bishop of all particular Churches, to the Exclusion of all others from being properly Bishops, and are all displaceable at his Pleasure.* Can it now enter into

p. 6.

P. 197. n. 3.

N. 4.

Greg. ep. 1. 4.
ep. 32.]

your

your Mind, that Gregory should ever think that these Bishops should all make themselves the Pope's *Vassals* of their own free Choice? We see even under the great *Usurpations* of the Bishop of *Rome* since, though they pretend (for all that I can see) to be *Oecumenical* Bishops in a higher Sense than ever *John* pretended to, that yet the Bishops of the *Roman Communion* are not willing to submit their Office wholly to the *Papal Jurisdiction*; witness the stout and eager Contests of the *Spanish* Bishops in the *Council of Trent*, about the *Divine Institution of the Episcopal Office*, against the Pretences of the *Italian Party*. And shall we then think when the Pope was far from that Power which he hath since *Usurped*, that such a Multitude of grave and resolute Bishops should throw their *Miters* down at the Pope's Feet, and offer him in your *literal Sense*, to be *sole Bishop of the World*? That they would relinquish their Power, which they made no Question they had from *Christ*, and take it up again at the Pope's Hands? But whether you can imagine this of so many Bishops or no, Can you conceive that Gregory should think so of them? and he must do it, if he took the Title of *Universal Bishop* in your *literal Sense*; and yet this Gregory saith, *Hoc Universalitatis nomen oblatum est*, That very Name of *Universal Bishop* was offered to the Pope by the *Council of Chalcedon*; Sed nullus unquam Decessorum meorum hoc tam prophano Vocabulo uti consensit. Nothing then can be more plain, than that *John* took that which the Pope refused. And he that can believe that this Title should ever be offered in this *literal Sense*, I despair without the help of *Physick* to make him believe any thing. 2. This very Title was not *usurped* wholly by *John* himself, but was given him in a *Council* at *Constantinople*. This Gregory confesseth in his Epistle to *Eulogius* and *Anastasius* the Patriarchs of *Antioch* and *Alexandria*, that about eight Years before, in the time of *Pelagius* his Predecessor, *John* called a *Council* at *Constantinople* in which he endeavours to be called *Universal Bishop*; so Gregory: but he confesseth elsewhere that he effected it. And it appears by the Epistle of *Pelagius* himself writ on that Occasion, that it was more than a meer Endeavour, and that they did consent to it; else, Why doth *Pelagius* say, *Quicquid in vestro conventiculo statuistis*, Whatever they had determined in their Conventicle (as on this account *Pelagius* calls it, because it wanted his Approbation)? And it is evident from Gregory's zealous Writing to the other Patriarchs about it, that they did not look on themselves as so much concerned about it. Now in this *Council* which met at *Constantinople*, which was called together in the case of Gregory the Patriarch of *Antioch*, all the Patriarchs either by themselves or *Substitutes* were present, as *Evagrius* tells us, and not only they but several *Metropolitans* too; now if they had taken this in the *literal Sense*, Can you think they would have yielded to it? Were not they much more concerned about it than either *Pelagius* or Gregory were? For they were near him, and were sure to live under this *usurped Power* of his, and to smart by it, if it were so great as you suppose it to be. But it is apparent by their yielding to it, they looked on it, to be sure, not in the *literal Sense*, and it may be as no more than the *Honorary Title* of *Oecumenical Patriarch*.

3. How comes it to pass, that none of the Successors of *John* and *Cyriacus* did ever challenge this Title in the *literal Sense* of it? For we do not see that they quitted it, for all *Phocas* gave it to Pope *Boniface*, since by your own Confession in the *Greek Canon-Law*, *Sisinius*, *German*, *Constantine*, *Alexius*, and others are called *Oecumenical Patriarchs*: And it appears by the Epistles of *Pelagius* and Gregory, that was the Title which *John* had then given him. *Si summus Patriarcha Universalis dicitur, Patriarcharum nomen cæteris denegatur*,

Greg. l. 4. ep. 36.

Ibid.

Greg. ep. l. 4.
ep. 34.Pelag. 2. ep. 8.
apud Bin. T. 4.
Council.Evagr. hist.
l. 6. c. 7.

p. 7.

Ibid.

denegatur, saith Pelagius. Si enim hoc dici licenter permittitur, honor Patriarcharum omnium negatur, saith Gregory. From which Words I think it most probable, that the main Ambition of the Patriarchs of Constantinople, was not merely that they would be called *Oecumenical Patriarchs*, but that Title should properly belong to them, as excluding others from it, which was it that touched the Bishops of Rome to the quick; because then Constantinople flourished, as much as Rome decayed by the Oppressions of the Lombards; and Gregory complained of this to Constantia the Empress, that for seven and twenty Years together they had lived in Rome, *inter Longobardorum gladios* (among the Swords of the Lombards) and this made them so jealous, that the Honour of the Roman See was then sinking, and therefore they stickle so much against this Title, and draw all the invidious Consequences from it possible, the better to set the other Patriarchs against it; and because that would not extend far beyond the Patriarchs themselves, they pretend likewise, that this was to make himself *Universal Bishop*. But not certainly in your *Literal Sense*; for then Gregory would have objected some Actions consequent upon this Title; in depriving Bishops of their Jurisdiction, and displacing some, and putting in others at his Pleasure; which you say, is the natural effect of this *Literal Sense* of *Universal Bishop*. But we read of nothing of this Nature done either by John or Cyriacus; they acted no more than they did, only enjoyed a higher Title. And this is proved further,

4. By the carriage of the Emperor Mauricius in this Business. Gregory writes a pitiful moaning Letter to him about it, and uses all the Rhetorick he had to perswade the Emperor, that he would either *flectere*, or *coercere*, *incline*, or *force him* to lay aside that arrogant Title: But for all this it appears by Gregory's Letter to the Empress, That the Emperor had checked him for meddling in it, and was so far from opposing the Patriarch's Title, that in effect he bid him trouble himself no more about it: Which poor S. Gregory took very ill. And afterwards, when Cyriacus succeeded John in Constantinople, the Emperor being somewhat fearful, lest Gregory at the coming in of a new Patriarch, might, on the account of this new Title, deny his *Communicatory Letters*, he dispatches a Letter to him to quicken him about it. And he takes it very unkindly that the Emperor should suspect his *Indiscretion* so much, that for the sake of this Title, which he saith, *had sorely wounded him*, he should deny Communion in the Faith with him; and yet in the same Epistle saith, *That whosoever took the Title of Universal Bishop upon him, was a Forerunner of Antichrist*. But if this Name had been apprehended in that which you call, *The Literal and Grammatical Sense*, Would not the Emperor (being commended by Gregory too for his Piety) have rather encouraged him in it? Whereas he plainly tells him, *It was a Contest about a frivolous Name, and nothing else; and that there ought to be no Scandal among them about it*. Upon which Gregory is put to his Distinctions of two sorts of *frivolous Things*, some that are very harmless, and some that are very hurtful, i.e. frivolous Things are either such as are frivolous, or such as are not; for, Who ever imagined, that such Things as are very hurtful, are frivolous? But however, S. Gregory speaks excellent Sense; for his meaning is, that the Title it self may be *frivolous*, but the Consequences of it may be dreadful, and so we have found it since his time. So that this appears to be the true State of the Business between them; the Patriarch of Constantinople, he challengeth the Title of *Oecumenical Patriarch* or Bishop, as belonging of right to him,

Triste mihi aliquid serenissimus Dominus innuit, quod non eum corripuit qui superbit, sed me magis ab intentione mea declinare studuit, Greg. l. 4. ep. 34.

Greg. l. 6. ep. 30.

De qua re mihi in suis iussionibus pietas praecepit dicens, ut pro appellationis frivoli nominis inter nos scandalum generari non debeat. Greg. ibid.

Sed rogo ut imperialis pietas penset, quia alia sunt frivola valde innoxia, alia valde nociva. Ibid.

him, being Patriarch of the *chief Seat* of the *Empire*, but in the mean time challengeth no *Universal Jurisdiction* by virtue of this Title: On which account the *Emperor* and *Eastern Bishops* admit of it: On the other side, the *Bishops of Rome*, partly looking at their own *Interest* in it (for so it appears by one of *Gregory's* Epistles to the *Emperor*, that he suspected it to be his own *Interest* which he stood so much up for) and partly foreseeing the dangerous *Consequence* of this, if *Universal Jurisdiction* were challenged with

Nunquid ego hac in re piissime Domine propriam causam defendo? nunquid specialem injuriam vindico? Id. l. 4. ep. 31.

it, they resolutely oppose it, not meerly for the *Title* sake, but for that which might follow upon that *Title*, taking it not in your *Literal*, but in your *Metaphorical Sense*, as I shall shew presently. But neither Party was so weak and silly, as to apprehend it in your *Literal Sense*; for then neither would the *Emperor* have slighted it, nor the *Popes* opposed it on those *Terms* which they do, and on such *Grounds* which reach your *Metaphorical Sense*.

5. The same *Title* in the same *Sense* which *Gregory* opposed it, did *Boniface* accept of, from the *Emperor Phocas*. This you confess your self, when you say, *That all that Phocas did, was but to declare that the Title in contest did of right belong to the Bishop of Rome only*; therefore the same *Title* which the *Patriarch of Constantinople* took to himself before, was both given by *Phocas*, and taken by *Pope Boniface*. This then being confessed by you, let me now seriously ask you, Whether the *Title of Universal Bishop*, which *Pope Gregory* opposed, was to be taken in the *Grammatical* or *Metaphorical Sense*? Take now, Whether of them you please; if in the *Metaphorical*, all his Arguments hold against the *Pope's present Universal Jurisdiction*, by your own Confession; if in the *Literal* and *Grammatical*, then *Pope Boniface* had all those Things belonging to him, which *Gregory* condemns that *Title* for. Then by your own Confession *Pope Boniface* must be the *Forerunner of Antichrist*, he must equal himself to *Lucifer in Pride*, he must have that *Name of Blasphemy* upon him, and all those dreadful *Consequences* must attend him and all his Followers, who own that *Title of Universal Bishop*, in that which you call the *Litteral* or *Grammatical Sense* of it.

6. Lastly, It appears from *S. Gregory* himself, that the *Reasons* which he urgeth against the *Title of Universal Bishop*, are such as hold against that which you call the *Metaphorical Sense* of it; which in short is, *An Universal Pastor exercising Authority and Jurisdiction over the whole Church*. And it is scarce possible to imagine, that he should speak more clearly against such an *Universal Headship* than he doth; and urges such Arguments against it, which properly belong to that *Metaphorical Sense* of it. As when he

Tu quid Christo Universalis sc. Ecclesie capiti, in extremi judicii examine diffusus es, qui cuncta ejus membra cibimet conaris universalis appellatione supponere? Greg. l. 4. ep. 38.

saith to *John the Patriarch*, *What wilt thou answer to Christ the Head of the Universal Church in the Day of Judgment, who dost endeavour to subject all his Members to thee, under the Name of Universal Bishop*? What is there in these Words which doth not fully belong to your *Metaphorical Sense of Head of the Church*? Doth he not subject all *Christ's Members* to him? Doth he not challenge to himself proper *Jurisdiction over them*? What then will he be able to answer to *Christ the Head of the Universal Church*, as *St. Gregory* understands it *exclusive* of any other? Doth

Ad culmen conatus est singularitatis erumpere, ut & nulli subesse & solus omnibus praeesse videretur. Id. ib.

not he arise to that height of *Singularity*, that he is subject to none, but rules over all? yet these are the very Words he uses; and, Can any more expressly describe your *Head of the Church* than these do? Yet herein he saith,

He imitates the Pride of Lucifer, who, according to *St. Gregory*, endeavoured

red to be the *Head of the Church Triumphant*, as the *Pope of the Church Militant*. And follows that parallel clove, *That an Universal Bishop imitates Lucifer in exalting his Throne above the Stars of God: For* (saith he)

What are all the Brethren the Bishops of the Universal Church, but the Stars of Heaven? And after Parallels

Quid enim fratres tui omnes Universalis Ecclesie Episcopi, nisi astræ cæli sunt? Ib.

ascends above the Heights of the Clouds. And again, saith he, *Surely the Apostle Peter was the first Member* (not the Head) *of the Holy and Universal Church.*

Paul, Andrew, and John, What are they else but the Heads of particular Churches? And yet they are all Members of the Church under one Head. Can any thing be more clear against any Head of the Universal Church, but Christ himself? When St. Peter is acknowledged to be only a

Certè Petrus Apostolus primum membrum sanctæ & universalis Ecclesie est. Paulus, Andreas, Joannes, quid aliud quam singularem sunt plebæ capita? Et tamen sub uno capite omnes sunt membra Ecclesie. Ibid.

prime Member of the Church; How then come his Successors to be the Heads of it? And, as he goes on, The Saints before the Law, under the Law, and under Grace, who all make up the Body of our Lord, they were all but Mem-

bers of the Church, and none of them would be called Universal. And, I pray, let his Holiness consider his following Words, *Let your Holiness acknowledge what Pride it is to be called by that Name, which none that was truly holy was ever call'd by.*

Vestra autem Sanctitas agnoscat, quantum apud se tumeat, quæ illo nomine vocari appetit, quo vocari nullus præsumpsit, qui veraciter sanctus fuit. Ibid.

And, Do you think now that these Expressions do not as properly reach your *Head of the Church*, as if they had been spoken by a Protestant against that Doctrine which you all own?

What is there in all this, that implies that others should be *no Bishops*, but only *Titular*? Yes, they may be as much Bishops as you acknowledge them to be, *i. e.* as to their power of Order, but not as to their Jurisdiction. For this,

you say and defend, comes from the *Head of the Church*; or else your *Monarchical Government* in the Church signifies nothing. Do not you make the *Pope Universal Pastor of the Church*, in as high a Sense as any of these Expressions carry it?

And when St. Gregory urges so often, *That if there be such an Universal Bishop, if he fails, the Church would fail too*; Do you deny the Consequence as to the Pope? Doth not Bellarmine tell us, when he writes of the Pope, he writes *de summa rei Christianæ*, *Of the main of all Christianity*, and surely then the Church must fail if the Pope's Supremacy doth?

And I pray now consider with your self, Whether this Answer which you say hath been given a hundred times over, can satisfy any reasonable Man?

Nay, Doth it not appear to be so absurd and incongruous, that it is matter of just Admiration, that ever it should have been given once; and yet you are wonderfully displeased that his Lordship should bring this Objection upon the Stage again. But, Do you think your Answers, like your Prayers, will do you good by being said so often over? Indeed therein they are alike, that they are both in an unknown Tongue. Your *Literal Sense of Universal Bishop* being in this case no more intelligible than your *Latin Prayers* to a Country Congregation.

These things being thus clear, I have prevented my self in the second Enquiry, in that I have proved already, that the Reasons which St. Gregory produceth hold against that Sense of *Universal Bishop*, which you own and contend for, as of right belonging to the Bishop of Rome. Although it were no difficult matter to prove, that, according to the most received Opinion in your Church, *viz. that all Jurisdiction in Bishops is derived from the Pope* (which Opinion you cannot but know is most acceptable at Rome, and was so at the Council of Trent) that that which you call the *Literal Sense*, doth follow your *Metaphorical*, *i. e.* If the Pope hath *Universal Jurisdiction* as

ð. 9.

Bellarmin de
Pontif. l. 4.
cap. 24.
Hist. Concil.
Trid. l. 7.
p. 611.

Greg. l. 4.
ep. 34.
l. 7. ep. 69.

Consentire in hoc scelesto vocabulo, est fidem
perdere. Greg. l. 4. ep. 39
* Absit à cordibus Christianorum nomen i-
stud Blasphemiae, in quo omnium Sacerdo-
rum honor admittitur, dum ab uno sibi de-
menter arrogatur. l. 4. ep. 32.

Greg. l. 4. Ep. himself, that therein, he was the Prince of Pride, the Forerunner of Antichrist,
32, 34, 38, 39. using a vain, new, rash, foolish, proud, prophane, erroneus, wicked, Hypocritical,
l. 6. Ep. 2. 29. singular, presumptuous, blasphemous Name. For all these goodly Epithets doth

Head of the Church, then other Bishops are not properly Bishops, nor Christ's Officers, but his. For what doth their Power of Order signifie as to the Church without the Power of Jurisdiction? And therefore, if they be taken only in partem sollicitudinis, and not in plenitudinem potestatis, according to the known distinction of the Court of Rome, it necessarily follows, that they are but the Pope's Officers, and are taken just into so much Authority as he commits to them, and no more. And this Bellarmine proves from the very Form of the Pope's Consecration of Bishops, whereby he commits the Power of governing the Church to him, and the Administration of it in Spirituals and Temporals. And you may see by the Speech of Father Laynez, in the Council of Trent, how stoutly he proves that the Power of Jurisdiction was given wholly to the Bishop of Rome, and that none in the Church besides hath any spark of it but from him; that the Bishop of Rome is true and absolute Monarch, with full and total Power and Jurisdiction, and the Church is subject unto him, as it was to Christ. And, as when his Divine Majesty did govern it, it could not be said that any of the faithful had any the least Power or Jurisdiction, but meer, pure, and total subjection; so it must be said in all Perpetuity of time, and so understood, that the Church is a Sheepfold and a Kingdom. And, that he is the Only Pastor, is plainly proved by the Words of Christ, when he said, he hath other Sheep which he will gather together, and so one Sheepfold should be made, and one Shepherd. What think you now of the Literal Sense of Universal Bishop, for the Only Bishop? Are not the Only Bishop, and the Only Pastor all one? Will not all those Words of St. Gregory reach this, which any of you make use of to prove, that he takes it in the worst and Literal Sense? nay, it goes higher. For Gregory only argues, that from the Title of Universal Bishop he must be sole Bishop, and others could not be any True Bishops; but here it is asserted in plain Terms, that the Bishop of Rome is the only Pastor, and that as much as if Christ himself were here upon Earth, and therefore if your Literal Sense hath any Sense at all in it, it is much more true of the Bishop of Rome, than ever it could be of the Patriarch of Con-

stantinople. And therefore I pray think more seriously of what he saith, That to agree in that prophane Word, is to lose the Faith; * That such a blasphemous Name should be far from the Hearts of Christians, in which by the Arrogance of one Bishop, the Honour of all is taken away. Neither will it serve your turn to say (which

is all that you have to say) that this is not the definitive Sentence of your Church, but that many in your Church hold otherwise, That there is Power of Jurisdiction properly in Bishops. For, although these latter are not near the Number of the other, nor so much in favour with your Church, but are looked on as a discontented Party, as appears by the Proceedings in the Council of Trent; yet that is not it we are to look after, What all in your Church are agreed on, but what the Pope challengeth as belonging to himself. Was not Father Laynez his Doctrine highly approv'd at Rome, as well as by the Cardinal Legates at Trent, and all the Italian Party? Were not the other Party discountenanced and disgraced as much as might be? Doth not the Pope arrogate this to himself, to be Oecumenical Pastor, and the sole Fountain of all Jurisdiction in the Church? If so, all that ever S. Gregory said against that Title, falls most heavily upon the Pope. For, S. Gregory doth not stand upon what others attributed to him, but what he arrogated to

S. Gregory

S. Gregory bestow upon it; and, I believe, if he could have thought of more, and worse, he would as freely have bestowed them. If therefore John the Patriarch was said by him to *transgress God's Laws, violate the Canons, dishonour the Church, despise his Brethren, imitate Lucifer*, How much more doth this belong to him, that not only challengeth to be *Oecumenical Patriarch*, but the *sole Pastor* of the Church, and that all *Jurisdiction* is derived from him? And by this time I hope you see, that the Answer you say hath been given a *hundred Times over*, is so pitifully weak, absurd and ridiculous, that you might have been ashamed to have produced it *once*, and much more to repeat it without saying any more for it than you do. For, your other Discourse depends wholly upon it, and all that being taken away, the rest doth fall to the Ground with it.

We must now therefore return to his Lordship's Discourse, in which he goes on to give an account of the rise of the Pope's Greatness. "As yet, saith he, The right of *Election*, or Ratification of the Pope, continued in the Emperor: but then the *Lombards* grew so great in *Italy*, and the *Empire* was so infested with *Saracens*, and such Changes happened in all Parts of the World, as that neither for the present, the Homage of the Pope was useful for the Emperor; nor the Protection of the Emperor available for the Pope. By this means the Bishop of *Rome* was left to play his own Game by himself. A thing which as it pleased him well enough, so both he and his Successors made great Advantage by it. For, being grown to that Eminence by the Emperor, and the greatness of that City and Place of his Abode; he found himself the more free, the greater the Tempest was, that beat upon the other: And then first he set himself to alienate the Hearts of the *Italians* from the Emperor. Next he opposed himself against him. And about A. D. 710. Pope Constantine 1. did also first of all openly confront Philippicus the Emperor, in defence of Images, as Onuphrius tells us. After him Gregory 2. and 3. did the same by Leo Isaurus. By this Time the *Lombards* began to pinch very close, and to vex on all Sides, not *Italy* only, but *Rome* also. This drives the Pope to seek a new Patron. And very fitly he meets with Charles Martell in France, that famous Warrior against the *Saracens*. Him he implores in Defence of the Church against the *Lombards*. This Address seems very advisedly taken, at least it proves very fortunate to them both: For in short time it dissolved the Kingdom of the *Lombards* in *Italy*, which had then stood two hundred and four Years, which was the Pope's Security. And it brought the Crown of France into the House of Charles, and shortly after the Western Empire: And now began the Pope to be great indeed. For by the Bounty of Pepin, Son of Charles, that which was taken from the *Lombards*, was given to the Pope. So that now of a Bishop, he became a Temporal Prince. But when Charles the Great had set up the Western Empire, then he resumed the ancient and original Power of the Emperor, to govern the Church, to call Councils, to order Papal Elections. And this Power continued in his Posterity. For this right of the Emperor was in force and use in Gregory the seventh's time, who was confirmed in the Popedom by Henry the fourth, whom he afterward deposed. And it might have continued longer, if the succeeding Emperors had had Abilities enough to secure or vindicate their own Right. But the Pope keeping a strong Council about him, and meeting with some weak Princes, and they oft-times distracted with great and dangerous Wars, grew stronger till he got the better. So this is enough to shew, How the Popes climbed up by the Emperors, till they over topt them, which is all I said before, and have now proved. And this was about the Year 1073. Yet was it carried in succeeding Times with great Changes of Fortune and

P. 200.

" different Success. The *Emperor* sometimes plucking from the *Pope*, and
 " the *Pope* from the *Emperor*, winning and losing Ground, as their Spirits,
 " Abilities, Aids, and Opportunities were, till at the last the *Pope* settled
 " himself upon the Grounds laid by *Gregory 7.* in the great Power which he
 " now uses in and over these Parts of the Christian World. To all this you
 return a short Answer, in these Words; *We deny not but that in Temporal Power*
and Authority the Pope's grew great by the Patronage of Christian Emperors.
But what is this to the purpose? If he would have said any thing material, he
should have proved that the Popes rose by the Emperor's means to their Spiritual
Authority and Jurisdiction over all other Bishops throughout the whole Catho-
lick Church; which is the only thing they claim jure Divino, and which is so an-
nexed to the Dignity of their Office by Christ's Institution; that, were the Pope de-
prived of all his Temporalities, yet could not his Spiritual Authority suffer the
least Diminution by it. But 1. Doth his Lordship's Discourse only contain an
 account of the *Pope's temporal Greatness by the Patronage of Christian Empe-*
rors? Doth he not plainly shew, How the *Popes* got their Power by rebelling,
 and contesting with the *Emperors* themselves, How they assumed to themselves
 a Power to depose *Emperors*: and, Do they claim these things *jure Divino*
 too? 2. What you say of the *Pope's Spiritual Authority*, will then hold good
 when it is well proved; but bare asserting it, will never do it. We must there-
 fore have Patience till you have leisure to attempt it.

P. II.

P. 181. n. 13.

But in the mean time we must consider, How you vindicate the famous
 place of *Irenæus*, concerning, as you say, the *Pope's Supreme Pastoral Au-*
thority, from his Lordship's Interpretation. Yet, before we come to the *Au-*
thority it self, there are some light Skirmishes (as you call them) to be passed
 through; and those are, concerning *Irenæus* himself. For his Lordship
 saith, *That his Adversary is much scanted of ancient proof, if Irenæus stand*
alone; besides, Irenæus was a Bishop of the Gallican Church, and a very un-
likely Man to captivate the Liberty of that Church under the more powerful
Principality of Rome. And how can we have better Evidence of his Judgment,
touching that Principality, than the Actions of his Life? When Pope Victor
excommunicated the Asian Churches, &c. &c. all at a blow, was not Irenæus the
chief Man that reprehended him for it? A very unmeet and undutiful thing
sure it had been in Irenæus, in deeds to tax him of Rashness and Inconside-
rateness, whom in Words A. C. would have to be acknowledged by him, the Su-
preme and Infallible Pastor of the Universal Church. To which you Answer,

P. 201. n. 6.

1. *To the Liberty of the Gallican Church: As if (forsooth) the so much talked*
of Liberties of the Gallican Church, had been things known or heard of in
St. Irenæus his Time; as though there were no difference between not
captivating the Liberty of that Church to Rome, and asserting the Liberties
of the Gallican Church in her Obedience to Rome, yet these two must be
confounded by you to render his Lordship's Answer ridiculous; which yet
is as sound and rational as your Cavil is vain and impertinent. But this
 you pass over and fix 2. *Upon his reprehending Pope Victor, where (you say)*
that Eusebius hath not a word importing Reprehension, but rather a friendly and
seasonable Perswasion: his Words are *μετανοήσας καὶ ἠμείβετο* &c. he exhorts him after
 a handsome manner, as reflecting on the *Pope's Dignity*, and clearly shews that
 the *Pope* had of right some Authority over the *Asian Bishops*, and by consequence
 over the whole Church. For otherwise it had been very absurd in *St. Irenæus* to
 perswade *Pope Victor*, not to cut off from the Church so many Christian Pro-
 vinces, had he believed (as Protestants contend he did) that the *Pope* had no
 Power at all to cut them off. Just as if a Man should entreat the *Bishop of Ro-*
chester, not to excommunicate the *Archbishop of York* and all the *Bishops* of his
 Province;

Province, over whom he hath not any the least Pretence of Jurisdiction. I Answer, that if you say, that Eusebius hath not a Word importing Reprehension, it is a sign you have not read what Eusebius saith. For, doth not he expressly say, *That the Epistles of some of the Bishops are yet remaining, in which they do severely rebuke him?* Among whom (saith he) Irenæus was one, &c. It seems, Irenæus was one of those Bishops who did so sharply reprehend him;

but it may be, you would render *παλινωτέρον καὶ ἀσχητόν* kissing his Holiness Feet, or, exhorting him after a handsome manner; and indeed, if they did it sharply, they did it *περὶ τοῦ* suitably enough to what Victor deserved for his rash and inconsiderate Proceedings in this Business. But withal to let you see how well these Proceedings of his were resented in the Christian World,

Eusebius tells us before, *That Victor by his Letters did declare those of the Eastern Churches to be excommunicate:*

and he presently adds, *But this did no ways please all the Bishops;* wherefore (*ἀντιπαροχλευήσιν*) they countermanded him, that he might mind the things of Peace and

Unity, and Brotherly Love. And will you still render that Word too, by exhorting him after an handsome manner, when even Christopherson renders it by *magnopere adhortabantur, Valesius by ex adverso hortati sunt?* And although these seem not to come up to the full Emphasis of the Word, yet surely they imply somewhat of Vehemency and Earnestness in their perswading him as well as their being hugely dissatisfied with what Victor did. I grant that these Persons did reflect (as you say) on the Pope, but not as you would have it on his Dignity, but on his Rashness and Indiscretion, that should go about to cast the Asian Churches out of Communion, for such a Trifle as that was in Controversie between them. But you are the happiest Man at making Inferences that I have met with: for, because Irenæus in the Name of the Gallican Bishops, writes to Victor, *not to proceed so rashly in this Action;* thence you infer, that the Pope had of right some Authority over the Asian Bishops, and by Consequence over the whole Church. Might you not every Jot as well infer, that when a Man in Passion is ready to kill those that stand about him; whoever perswades him not to do it, doth suppose he might lawfully have done it, if he would? But if those Bishops had so venerable an Esteem (as you would perswade us they had) then of the Bishop of Rome, How come they to dispute his Actions in so high a manner as they did? If they had looked on him as Universal Pastor of the Church, it had more become them to sit still and be quiet, than severely to reprehend him who was alone able to judge what was fit to be done and what not in those Cases. If the Pope had call'd them to Council to have known their Advice, it might have been their Duty to have given it him in the most humble and submissive manner that might be. But for them to intrude themselves into such an Office, as to advise the Head of the Church what to do in a matter peculiarly concerning him, as though he did not know what was fit to be done himself; methinks you should not imagine that these Men did act *περὶ τοῦ* as became them, in doing it. Could they possibly in any thing more declare, how little they thought it necessary for all Churches to conform to that of Rome, when they plead for Dissenters in such a matter which the Pope had absolutely declared himself about? And how durst any of them slight the Thunderbolts which the Pope threatened them with? Yet not only Polycrates and the Asian Bishops who joined with him profess themselves not at all affrighted at them; but the other Churches looked not on themselves as obliged to forsake their Communion on that Account. If this be such an Evidence of the Pope's Power in one

Sense,

ἔσονται δὲ αἱ τῶν φωνῶν παλινωτέ-
τερον καὶ ἀσχητόν τὸ βίβλ. 1. 5. c. 24.
καὶ ὁ Εὐσεβ. 1. 5. c. 24.

Ἄλλ' ἔτι καὶ τοῖς ἐπισκόποις ταῦτ' ἠ-
ρέσμετο, ἀπαραχέλευτοι δὲ ταῦτα αὐτῶ
τῆς εἰρήνης καὶ τῆς πρὸς τὸς παλαιοὺς εἰρή-
ως καὶ ἀγάπης προεῖν. Euseb. ibid.

Vales. not. in
Euseb. l. 5. c. 24.

Euseb. ibid.
Socr. l. 5. c. 22.

Africani Antistites Vigilium Romanum Episcopum damnatorum trium capitulorum Synodali ter à Catholica communione, reservato ei penitentia loco, recludunt. Victor Tununens. Chronic. p. 10.

sense, I am sure it is a greater Evidence of his *Weakness* in another : It seems the *Head* of the *Church* began betimes to be troubled with the *Fumes* of *Pas-*
sion ; and it is a little unhappy, that the first *Instance* of his *Authority* should
meet with so little regard in the Christian World. If the *Pope* did begin to
assume so early, you see it was not very well liked of by the *Bishops* of other
Churches. But it seems he had a mind to try his *Power* and the weight of
his *Arm* ; but for all his haste, he was fain to withdraw it very patiently
again. *Valesius* thinks that he never went so far as to excommunicate the
Asian Bishops at all, but the noise of his threatening to do it being heard by
them, (it seems the very preparing of his *Thunderbolts* amazed the World)
Irenæus having call'd a *Synod* of the *Bishops* of *Gaul* together, doth in their
name writethat *Letter*, in *Eusebius*, to *Victor* to dissuade him from it, and
that it wrought so effectually with him, that he gave it over. And this he
endeavours to prove, 1. Because *Eusebius* saith, he only endeavour'd to
do it. But *Cardinal Perron* supposeth *Eusebius* had a worse meaning than so
in it ; i. e. that though the *Pope* did declare them excommunicate, yet it took no
Effect because other *Bishops* continued still in communion with them ; and there-
fore he calls *Eusebius* an *Arrian* and an *Enemy* to the *Church* of *Rome*, when
yet all the *Records* of this *Story* are derived from him. 2. Because the *E-*
pistles of *Irenæus* tend to perswade him not to cut them off ; whereas, if
they had been excommunicate, it would have been rather to have restored
them to *Communion* ; and that *Photius* saith, that *Irenæus* writ many *Let-*
ters to *Victor* to prevent their *Excommunication*. But because *Eusebius*
saith expressly, That he did by *Letters* pronounce them out of the *Communion* of
the *Church*, the common *Opinion* seems more probable, and so *Socrates* un-
derstands it ; but still I am to seek for such an *Argument* of the *Acknow-*
ledgment of the *Pope's* *Authority* then, as you would draw from it. Yes,
say you, because they do not tell him, He had no *Authority* to do what he did ;
which they would have done if they could without proclaiming themselves *Schis-*
maticks ipso facto and shaking the very *Foundation* of the *Churches* *Discipline*
and *Unity*. But all this proceeds from want of *Understanding* the *Discipline* of
the *Church* at that time ; for *Excommunication* did not imply any such *au-*
thoritative Act of throwing men out of the *Communion* of the whole *Church*,
but only a declaring that they would not admit such *Persons* to *commu-*
nion with themselves. And therefore might be done by *Equals* to *Equals*,
and sometimes by *Inferiours* to *Superiours*. In *Equals*, it is apparent by *Jo-*
hannes Antiochenus in the *Ephesine Council* excommunicating *Cyril Patriarch*
of *Alexandria* ; and I suppose you will not acknowledge it may be done by
Inferiours, if we can produce any *Examples* of *Popes* being excommuni-
cated ; and what say you then to the *African Bishops* excommunicating
Pope Vigilius as *Victor Tununensis* an *African Bishop*
himself relates it : Will you say now that *Victor's* ex-
communicating the *Asian Churches* argued his *Authority* over them, when another *Victor* tells us, That the
African Bishops solemnly excommunicated the *Pope*
himself ? And I hope you will not deny but the *Bishop* of *Rochester* might as
well excommunicate the *Archbishop* of *Tork*, as these *Africans* excommuni-
cate the *Bishop* of *Rome*. What say you to the expunging the Name of
Felix Bishop of *Rome* out of the *Diptychs* of the *Church*, by *Acacius* the *Pa-*
triarch of *Constantinople* ? What say you to *Hilary's Anathema* against *Pope*
Liberius ? If these *Excommunications* did not argue just *Power* and *Authority*
over the *Persons* excommunicated, neither could *Pope Victor's* do it. For
it is apparent by the practice of the *Church* that *Excommunication* argued

no such Superiority in the Persons who did it; but all the Force of it lay in the Sense of the Church; for by whomsoever the Sentence was pronounced, if all other Churches observed it, (as most commonly they did while the Unity of the Church continued) then they were out of the Communion of the Catholick Church; if not, then it was only the particular Declaration of those Persons or Churches who did it. And in this Case the Validity of the Pope's Excommunication of the Asian Bishops depended upon the Acceptance of it by other Churches, which not consenting to it, he could not throw them out of the Communion of the whole Church, but only declare, that if they came to Rome, he would not admit them to Communion with him. And therefore Ruffinus well renders that place in Eusebius out of Irenæus his Epistle to Victor, ἐξέπρεβεν δὲ τὸ ἔθνος ἀπὸ τῆς ἐκκλησίας: By these Words, *Nunquam tamen ob hoc repulsi sunt ab Ecclesiæ societate, aut venientes ab illis partibus non sunt suscepti*, so that ἀπελάσθαι may as well signifie *not to receive as to cast out*; for the Churches not receiving, is her casting out. Thus, I hope, it is evident that his Lordship hath received no Injury by these lighter Skirmishes.

We now follow you into hotter Service; For you say, he ventures at last to grapple with the Authority it self, alledged by A. C. out of St. Irenæus; where, in the first place, you wink and strike; and let your Blows fall besides him, for fear he should return them, or some one for him. You Quarrel with his Translation of the Authority cited by him: but that the Ground of this Quarrel may be understood, we must first enquire what his Lordship hath to say for himself. The Place of Irenæus is, *To this Church (he speaks of Rome), propter potentiorum principalitatem, for the more powerful Principality of it, 'tis necessary that every Church, that is the faithful, undique round about, should have recourse.* Now for this, (his Lordship faith) there was very great Reason in Irenæus his time, that upon any Difference arising in the Faith, *Omnes undique Fideles, all the Faithful, or, if you will, all the Churches round about, should have recourse, that is, resort to Rome being the Imperial City, and so a Church of more powerful Principality, than any other at that time in those Parts of the World.* But this (his Lordship faith) will not exalt Rome to be Head of the Church Universal. Here your Blood rises, and you begin a most furious Encounter with his Lordship for translating *undique round about, as if (say you) St. Irenæus spake only of those neighbouring Churches round about Rome, and not the Churches throughout the World; whereas undique as naturally signifies, every where, and, from all Parts: witness Thomas Thomastus, where the word undique is thus Englished, From all Parts, Places, and Corners, every where.* Can you blame me now if I seek for a Retreat into some strong hold, or if you will, some more powerful Principality, when I see so dreadful a Charge begun, with Thomas Thomastus in the Front? You had routed us once before with Rider, and other English Lexicons; but it seems Rider had done Service enough that time, now that venerable Person Thomas Thomastus must be upon Duty, and do his share for the Catholick Cause. You somewhere complain how much Catholicks are straitned for want of Books, Would any one believe you that find you so well stored with Thomas Thomastus, Rider, and other English Lexicons? You would sure give us some Cause of Suspicion that there is some Jesuits School taught in England, and that you are the learned Master of it, by your being so conversant in these worthy Authors. But although the Authority of T. Thomastus signifie very little with us, yet that of the Greek Lexicons might

q. 12.
P. 201.

Ad hanc Ecclesiam propter potentiorum principalitatem, necesse est omnem convenire Ecclesiam, i. e. eos qui sunt undique fideles: Inquit semper ab his qui sunt undique, conservata est ea que est ab Apostolis traditio. Iren. l. 3. c. 3.

De Finib. l. 2.
v. Hen. Steph.
Lexicon Cice-
ron. p. 55.

Herod. Hist.
l. 1. p. 18.

Concil. An-
tioch. Can. 9.

Leo. Sermon.
de S. Petro &
Paulo.

P. 202.

might do much more if we had the Original Greek of *Irenæus* instead of his barbarous Latine Interpreter. For now it is uncertain what Word *Irenæus* used, and so it is but a very uncertain Conjecture which can be drawn from the Signification of Πάντοθεν, πανταχόθεν, ἀπασί, unless we knew, which of them was the genuine Word in the Greek of *Irenæus*. But you say, *All of them undeniably signifie, from all parts Universally*: and that because they are rendred by the Word *undique*. So that this will make an excellent proof, *undique* must signifie from all Parts, because πάντοθεν, πανταχόθεν, ἀπασί do signifie so in Greek; and that these do undeniably signifie so much, appears because they are rendred by *undique*. And I grant they are so; for in the old Glossary, which goes under the Name of *Cyril*, *undique* is rendred by πανταχόθεν, and *Tully* (than whom we cannot possily desire a better Author in this case) renders πάντοθεν, by *undique*. For in his Book *de Finibus*, he translates that of *Epicurus* πάντοθεν εἰσπληρωμένοις τῶν ἡδονῶν by *undique* complerentur voluptatibus; and so he renders that Passage in *Plato's Timæus*, πανταχῇ τε ἐκ μέσων ἴσων by *undique* æquabilem, although, as *Hen. Stephanus* notes, that be rather the Signification of πανταχόθεν than πανταχῇ, but still there is some difference between πανταχόθεν, and ἀπανταχόθεν, and so ἀπανταχόθεν ἦν in Greek Authors notes *ex omni parte terræ*, but πανταχόθεν only *ex quâvis parte*; so that the one signifies *Universally*, the other *Indefinitely*: *undique* relating properly to the Circumference, as *undique equalis*, on all sides it is equal; so that *qui sunt undique fideles*, are, those which lie upon all Quarters round about. And so it doth not imply that all Persons were bound to come, but that from all Quarters some did come; as *Herodian* speaks of *Rome*, πολυανθρώπη τε ἔση, καὶ τὸς πανταχόθεν ἰσπερχομένη, that it was very populous, and did receive them which came from all Parts; which doth very fitly explain the Sense of *Irenæus*, that to *Rome* being the Imperial City, Men came from all Quarters. But the Sense of this will be more fully understood by a parallel Expression in the Ninth Canon of the Council of *Antioch*, in which it is decreed, that the Metropolitan should have the Care of all the Bishops in his Province, διὰ τὸ ἐν τῇ μητροπόλει πανταχόθεν συντρέχειν πάντας τὸς τὰ περὶ γράμματα ἐχούσας, because all Persons who have Business from all Parts, resort to the Metropolis: here πανταχόθεν συντρέχειν, is the very same with the *undique* convenire, in *Irenæus*; so that it relates not to any Obligation on Churches to resort thither, but that being the Seat of the Empire, all Believers from all Parts did make their Recourse thither. Which is most fully expressed by *Leo*, speaking of *S. Peter's coming to Rome*, Cujus nationis homines in hac Urbe non essent? aut qua uspiam gentes ignorarent, quod Roma didicisset? And so, if I grant you that it extends to all Parts, I know not what Advantages you will get by it; for *Irenæus* his Design is, to shew that there was no such secret Tradition left by the Apostles, as the *Valentinians* pretended. And for this he appeals to the Church of *Rome*, which being seated in the Imperial City, to which Believers from all Parts did resort, it is impossible to conceive that the Apostles should have left such a Tradition, and it not to be heard of there: which is the plain, genuine meaning of *Irenæus* his Words. Not as you weakly imagine, That all Churches in all Doubts of Faith, were bound to have their Recourse thither, as to their constant guide therein. For *Irenæus* was not disputing, What was to be done by Christians in Doubts of Faith; but was enquiring into a matter of Fact, viz. Whether any such Tradition were ever left in the Church, or no; and therefore nothing could be more pertinent or convincing, than appealing to that Church to which Christians resorted from all Parts; for it could not be conceived, but, if the Apostles had left such a Tradition

tion

tion any where, it would be heard of at Rome. And you most notoriously pervert the meaning of *Irenæus*, when you would make the Force of his Argument to lie in the Necessity of all Christians resorting to Rome, because the Doctrine or Tradition of the Roman Church was, as it were, the Touchstone of all Apostolical Doctrine. But, I suppose, you deal in some *English Logicians*, as well as *English Lexicons*, and therefore I must submit both to your Grammar and Logick; But your Ingenuity is as great as your Reason; for you first pervert his Lordships meaning, and then make him dispute ridiculously, that you might come out with your triumphant Language, *Is not this fine Meandricks Logick, well beseeeming so noble a Labyrinth?* Whereas his Lordships reasoning is so plain and clear, that none but such a one as had a *Labyrinth* in his Brains, could have imagined any *Meanders* in it? As appears by what I have said already, in the Explication of the Meaning of *Irenæus*.

But that I may see the strength of your Logick out of this Place of *Irenæus*, I will translate *undiq;* and *semper*, as fully as you would have me, and give you the Words at large, in which, by those who come from all Places, the Apostolical Tradition is always conserved. What is it you infer hence? From the Premises you argue thus: All the faithful every where, must of necessity have recourse to the Church of Rome, by reason of her more powerful Principality. This is *S. Irenæus* his Proposition. But there could be no Necessity they all should have Recourse to that Church, by reason of her more powerful Principality, if her said Power extended not to them all. This is evident to Reason. Ergo, this more powerful Principality of the Roman Church, must needs extend to all the faithful every where, and not only to those of the Suburbicary Churches, or Patriarchal Diocese of Rome, as the Bishop pleads. Now I see, you are a man at Arms, and know, not only how to grapple with his Lordship, but with *Irenæus* to boot. But we must first see, How *Irenæus* himself argues, that we may the better understand the Force of what you deduce from him. The Question, as I have told you already, was, Whether the Apostles left any such Tradition in the Church, as the *Valentinians* pretended: *Irenæus* proves they did not, because, if there had been any such, the Apostolical Churches would certainly have preserved the Memory of it; but because it would be too tedious to insist on the Succession of all Churches, he therefore makes choice of the most famous, the Church of Rome, in which the Apostolical Tradition had been derived by a Succession of Bishops down to his own time; and by this (saith he) we confound all those who through vain glory, or blindness, do gather any such thing. For (saith he) to this Church for the more powerful Principality all Churches do make resort, i. e. the Believers from all Parts, in which by those who come from all Parts the Apostolical Tradition is always preserved. We must now see, How *Irenæus* argues according to your Sense of his Words. If all the faithful every where, must of Necessity have Recourse to the Church of Rome, for her more powerful Principality; then there is no secret Tradition left by the Apostles. But, Where lies the Connexion between these two? What had the *Valentinians* to do with the Power of the Church of Rome over other Churches? That was not the Business they disputed; their Question was, Whether there were no such Tradition as they pretended? And Rome might have never so great Power over all Churches, and yet have this secret Tradition too. For now we see, when she pretends to the greatest Power, nay, to *Infallibility*, she pretends the highest to Traditions. Where then lies the force of *Irenæus* his Argument? Was it in this, that the *Valentinians* did acknowledge the *Infallibility* of the Church of Rome then, in Traditions? This were indeed to the

D. 13.

P. 203.

Purpose, if it could be proved; Or, Doth Irenæus go about to prove this first? But by what Argument doth he prove it so, that the *Valentinians* might be convinced by it? *Tes*, say you, *he saith, That all the Faithful must of necessity have recourse to the Church of Rome*? This is your way of proving indeed, to take Things for granted; but, How doth this *Necessity* appear? Because, say you, *She hath the more powerful Principality*: But, What *Principality* do you mean? Over all *Churches*? But that was the thing in *Question*. So that if you will make *Irenæus* speak Sense, and argue pertinently, his Meaning can be no other than this. If there be such a *Tradition* left, it must be left somewhere among *Christians*: If it be left among them, it may be known by Enquiry, Whether they own any such or no. But because it would be troublesome searching of all *Churches*, we may know their Judgment more compendiously; there is the *Church of Rome* near us, a famous and ancient *Church*, seated in the chief *City* of the *Empire*, to which all Persons have *Necessities* to go; and among them, you cannot but suppose, but that out of every *Church* some faithful Persons should come, and therefore it is very unreasonable to think, that the *Apostolical Tradition* hath not always been preserved there, when Persons come from all Places thither. Is not every Thing in this Account of *Irenæus* his Words very clear and pertinent to his present Dispute? But in the Sense you give of them they are little to the Purpose, and very Precarious and inconsequent. And therefore since the more powerful *Principality* is not that of the *Church*, but of the *City*; since the necessity of *Recourse* thither, is not for *Doubts of Faith*, but other Occasions: Therefore it by no Means follows thence, *That this Church's Power did extend over the Faithful every where*; thus by explaining your Proposition, your Conclusion is ashamed of it self, and runs away. For your Argument comes to this; If English men from all Parts be forced to resort to *London*, then *London* hath the Power over all *England*; or if one should say, if some from all *Churches* in *England* must resort to *London*, then the *Church* at *London* hath Power over all the *Churches* in *England*; and if this Consequence be good, yours is: For it is of the same Nature of it; the Necessity of the *Resort*, not lying in the *Authority* of the *Church*, but in the *Dignity* of the *City*, the Words in all probability in the Greek, being *ὅτι τὸν ἡμετέραν ἀρχὴν*, and so relate to the *Dignity* of *Rome*, as the *Imperial City*.

¶ 14.

P. 183.

From whence we proceed to the Vindication of *Ruffinus*, in his Translation of the 6th *Canon* of the *Council* of *Nice*. The Occasion of which is this. His Lordship saith, *Supposing that the powerful Principality be ascribed to the Church of Rome, yet it follows not that it should have Power over all Churches; for this Power was confined within its own Patriarchate and Jurisdiction, and that* (saith he) *was very large, containing all the Provinces in the Diocese of Italy (in the old Sense of the Word Diocese) which Provinces the Lawyers and others term Suburbicaries. There were ten of them; the three Islands, Sicily, Corsica and Sardinia, and the other seven upon the firm Land of Italy. And this, I take it, is plain in Ruffinus. For he living shortly after the Nicene Council, as he did, and being of Italy, as he was, he might very well know the bounds of the Patriarch's Jurisdiction, as it was then practised. And he says*

Apud Alexandriam ut in Urbe Romæ vetusta consuetudo servetur, ut ille Ægypti ut hic Suburbicariarum Ecclesiarum sollicitudinem gerat. Ruffin. Eccles. hist. l. i. c. 6.

expressly, that according to the old Custom, the Roman Patriarch's Charge was confined within the Limits of the Suburbican Churches. To avoid the Force of this Testimony, Cardinal Perron lays load upon Ruffinus. For

he charges him with Passion, Ignorance, and Rashness. And one piece of his Ignorance is, that he hath ill translated the Canon of the Council of Nice. Now,
although

although his Lordship doth not approve of it as a Translation; yet he saith, Ruffinus living in that Time and Place, was very like well to know and understand the Limits and Bounds of that Patriarchate of Rome, in which he lived. This (you say) is very little to his Lordship's Advantage, since it is inconsistent with the Vote of all Antiquity, and gives S. Irenæus the Lye; but if the former be no truer than the latter, it may be very much to his Advantage, notwithstanding what you have produced to the contrary. What the ground is, Why the Roman Patriarchate was confined within the Roman Diocese, I have already shewed in the precedent Chapter, in Explication of the Nicene Canon. We must now therefore examine the Reasons you bring, Why the Notion of the Suburbicary Churches must be extended beyond the Limits his Lordship assigns; that of the smallness of Jurisdiction compared with other Patriarchs, I have given an account of already, viz. from the Correspondency of the Ecclesiastical and Civil Government; for the Civil Dioceses of the Eastern part of the Empire did extend much farther than the Western did; and that was the Reason, Why the Patriarchs of Antioch and Alexandria, had a larger Metropolitcal Jurisdiction than the Bishop of Rome had. But you tell us, That Suburbicary Churches must be taken as generally all Churches and Cities any ways subordinate to the City of Rome; which was all at that time known by the Name of Urbs, or City, κατ' ἑξοχήν, by way of Excellency; not as it related to the Præfect or Governour of Rome, in regard of whose ordinary Jurisdiction, we confess it commanded only those few Places about it in Italy; but as it related to the Emperor himself; in which Sense the Word Suburbicary, rightly signifies all Cities or Churches whatsoever within the Roman Empire; as the Word Romania also anciently signified the whole Imperial Territory, as Card. Perron clearly proves upon this Subject. But, this is one Instance of what Mens Wits will do, when they are resolved to break through any thing: For, whoever that had read of the Suburbicary Regions and Provinces in the Code of Theodosius, or other Parts of the Civil Law, as distinguished from other Provinces under the Roman Empire, and those in Italy too, could ever have imagined that the Notion of Suburbicary Churches had been any other than what was correspondent to those Regions and Provinces? But let that be granted which Sirmondus so much contends for, that the Notion of Suburbicary may have different Respects, and so sometimes be taken for the Churches within the Roman Diocese, sometimes for those within the Roman Patriarchate, and sometimes for those, which are under the Pope as Universal Pastor; yet, How doth it appear that ever Ruffinus took it in any other than the first Sense? No other Provinces being called Suburbicary, but such as were under the Jurisdiction either of the Roman Præfect within a hundred Miles of the City (within which compass, References and Appeals were made to him) or at the most, to the Lieutenant of the Roman Diocese, whose Jurisdiction extended to those ten Provinces which his Lordship mentions. It is not therefore, in what Sense Words may be taken, but in what Sense they were taken, and what Evidence there is that ever they were so understood. Never was any Controversie more ridiculous, than that concerning the extent of the Suburbicary Regions or Provinces, if Suburbicary were taken in your Sense for all the Cities within the Roman Empire. But this Extending to the Suburbicary Churches, as far as the Roman Empire, is like the Art of those Jesuits, who in their setting forth Anastasius de vitis Pontificum, in Stephanus 5. turn'd Papa Urbis into Papa Orbis; for that being so mean and contemptible a Title, they thought much it should remain as it did; but Papa Orbis was magnificent and glorious. I wonder therefore, that instead of extending

P. 203. n. 7.

Cod. Theod. l. 11. tit. 1. c. 9. tit. 16. c. 12. tit. 28. 12.

Adventor. p. 2. de Eccles. suburbic. c. 1.

the Signification of *Suburbicary Churches*, you do not rather pretend that it ought to be read *Suborbicary*, and so to suit exactly with the *Papa Orbis*, as importing all those *Churches* which are under the Power of the *Universal Pastour*. For, Why should you stop at the Confines of the *Roman Empire*? How comes his Jurisdiction to be confined within that? By what right did he govern the *Churches* within the *Empire*, and not those without? Surely not, as *Primate*, *Metropolitan*, or *Patriarch* of the *Roman Empire*, for those are Titles yet unheard of in *Antiquity*; if as *Head of the Church*, How comes the *Jurisdiction* of that to be at all limited? Were there no *Churches* without the *Empire* then? I hope you will not deny that; If there were, To whom did the *Jurisdiction* over them belong? To the *Pope*, or not? If not, How comes he to be *Head of the Church*, and *Universal Pastour*? If they did, Why were not these *Suburbicary Churches*, as well as those within the *Empire*? Besides, it is confessed by the learnedest among you, that when the notion of *Suburbicary* is extended beyond the *Suburbicary Provinces*, it is not out of any relation to the *City*, but to the Power of the *Bishop* of the *City*, and therefore the *Suburbicary Churches* may be larger than the *Suburbicary Provinces*. But if this be true (as it is the only probable Evasion) then it is impossible for you, to confine the *Suburbicary Churches* within the *Roman Empire*, without confining the *Jurisdiction* of the *Roman Bishop* within those *Bounds* too. For if the enlarging the Notion of *Suburbicary Churches* depends upon the Extent of his Power, the fixing the *Limits* of those *Churches*, determines the *Bounds* of his Power too. Which is utterly destructive to your Pretences of the *Pope's* being *Head of the Universal Church*, and not barely of the *Churches* within the *Roman Empire*. But if it had been *Ruffinus* his Design to express by *Suburbicary Churches*, all those within the *Roman Empire*, surely he made choice of the most unhappy Expression to do it by, which he could well have thought of. For, it being then so well known what the *Suburbicary Provinces* were, that in the *Code of Theodosius*, where they are so often mentioned, they are not distinctly enumerated, because they were then as well understood as the *African*, *Gallican*, or *Britannick Provinces*; How absurd were it for him, to take a Word in common use, and so well known, and apply it to such a Sense, as no Example besides can be produced for it? For if any one at that time should have spoken of the *African*, *Gallican*, or *Britannick Churches*, no one would have imagined any other than those which were contained in the several *Provinces* under those Names. What Reason is there then, that any thing else should be apprehended by the *Suburbicary Churches*? I know the last Refuge of most of your side, instead of explaining these *Suburbicary Churches*, hath been to rail at *Ruffinus*, and call him *Dunce* and *Blockhead*, and Enemy to the *Roman Church* (Instances were easie to be given, if it were at all necessary) but besides that, it were easie to make it appear, that *Ruffinus* was no such Fool, as some have taken him for: (And if they think so, because *S. Hierom* gives him such hard Words, they must think so of all whom *S. Hierom* opposed) he is sufficiently vindicated in this Translation by the *Antient Vatican Copy* of the *Nicene Canons*, out of which this very *Canon* is produced by *Sirmondus*, and the very same Word of *Suburbicary* therein used,

De primatu Ecclesie Romanae & aliarum civitatum Episcopis. Antiqui moris est, ut Episcopus Urbis Romae habeat Principatum; Ut Suburbicaria loca, & omnem Provinciam suam sollicitudine gubernet. Codex Vaticanus apud Sirmond. de Regi. & Eccles. Suburb.

And that in such a Manner, as utterly destroys your Sense of the *Suburbicary Churches*, for such as are within the *Roman Empire*; for that Copy calls them, *Loca Suburbicaria*, and, Will you say, those are the *Provinces* within the *Roman Empire* too? Can any one

one rationally think that any other Places should be called *Suburbicary*, but such as lie *about the City*? And by the same Interpretation which you here use, you may call all *England* the *Suburbs* of *London*; because *London is the City*, κατ' ἐξοχὴν, as you speak; and therefore all the *Churches* of *England* must be *Suburbicary* to *London*. But if you think this incongruous, you may on the same Account judge the other to be so too: It appears then, that the *Suburbicary Places* in the *Vatican Copy* (and in that very *Antient Copy* which *Iustellus* had, which agrees with the *Vatican*) are the same with the *Suburbicary Churches* in *Ruffinus*; and, if you will explain these latter of the *Roman Empire*, you must do the former too. But not only the *Vatican Copy*, but all other different *Versions* of the *Nicene Canon* utterly overthrow this *Opinion* of *Cardinal Perron*, that the *Suburbicary Churches* must be taken for those within the *Roman Empire*. For in the *Arabick Version* published by *Turrianus*, it is thus rendred, *Siquidem similiter Episcopus Romæ, i. e. successor Petri Apostoli, potestatem habet omnium civitatum, & locorum quæ sunt circa eam*. Are all the *Cities* and *Places* in the *Roman Empire*, *circa eam*, about the *City* of *Rome*? If not, neither can the *Churches* be. And in that *Arabick Paraphrase*, which *Salmasius* had of the famous *Peireskius*, it is translated much more agreeably to the *Nicene Canon* in these Words; *Propterea quod Episcopus Romanus etiam hunc morem obtinet, & hoc ei adjunctum est, ut potestatem habeat supra civitates, & loca quæ prope eam sunt*. Which is yet more full, to shew the Absurdity of your Exposition, for these *Suburbicary Churches* must be then in *Places* near the *City* of *Rome*. And agreeably to these, *Aristinus*, the *Greek Collector* of the *Canons* hath it, καὶ ὁ Πάπυς τῶν κατὰ Ρώμην, which *Ruffinus* his *Suburbicary* doth exactly render. By whom now, must we be judged, what is meant by these *Suburbicary Churches*? By you who make a forced and strained Interpretation of the Word *Suburbicary* to such a Sense, of which there is no Evidence in *Antiquity*, or Reason, and is withal manifestly repugnant to the Design of the *Canon*, which is to proportion the *Dioceses* of the *Bishops* of *Antioch* and *Alexandria*, by the Example of *Rome* (which had been very absurd if these *Suburbicary Churches* did comprehend the *Dioceses* of *Alexandria* and *Antioch*, and all other *Provinces*, as you make them)? Or else must we be judged by the ancient *Versions* of the *Nicene Canon*, *Latin* and *Arabick*, and by other *Greek Paraphrases*, all which unanimously concur to overthrow that *Figment*, that the *Suburbicary Churches* are all those within the *Roman Empire*. And this the learned *Petrus de Marcâ* was so sensible of that he saith, *Ruffinus* did rectissime & ex usu recepto, very agreeably both to Reason and Custom, compare the *Alexandrian* and *Roman Bishop* in this, that he should have the Power over the *Diocese* of *Egypt*, by the same right that the *Bishop* of *Rome* had over the *Urbicary Diocese*; or, saith he, ut *Ruffinus elegantissime loquitur*, *In Ecclesiis Suburbicariis, id est, in iis Ecclesiis quæ decem Provinciis Suburbicariis continebantur*; as *Ruffinus* most elegantly speaks (sure then he thought him no such ignorant Person, as *Perron* and others from him have reproached him to be) *In the Suburbicary Churches*, that is, *in those Churches which are contained in the ten Suburbicary Provinces*. For, as he goes on, *the calling of Synods, the Ordination of Bishops, the full Administration of the Churches in those Provinces, did belong to the Bishop of Rome; as to the Bishop of Alexandria in the Ægyptian Diocese, and to the Bishop of Antioch in the Oriental*. Which he likewise confirms by the ancient *Latin Interpreter* of the *Nicene Canons*, who, he saith, was elder than *Dionysius Exiguus*; in whose Interpretation, he makes the *Suburbicaria loca* to contain the *four Regions* about

De Concordia
Sacerdot. &
Imp. l. i. c. 7.
sect. 6.

about Rome, which made the proper Metropolitan Province of the *Roman Bishop*, comprehending sixty nine *Bishopricks*; and that which he calls his Province, to be the *Urbicary Diocese*, contained in those ten Provinces which his Lordship mentions.

§. 15. But the Pope's being *Universal Bishop* having so little Evidence elsewhere, his Lordship's Adversary at last hath Recourse to this, *That the Bishop of Rome is S. Peter's Successor, and therefore to him we must have Recourse.* To which his Lordship answers; *The Fathers I deny not, ascribe very much to S. Peter; but 'tis to S. Peter in his own Person. And among them Epiphanius is as free and as frequent in extolling S. Peter, as any of them: And yet did he never intend to give an absolute Principality to Rome in S. Peter's Right; which he at large manifests, by a Place particularly insisted on, in which he proves, that the building of the Church on S. Peter in Epiphanius his Sense, is not as if he and his Successors were to be Monarchs over it for ever: but it is the edifying and establishing the Church in the true Faith of Christ, by the Confession which S. Peter made. And so, saith he, he expresses himself elsewhere most plainly, that Christ's building his Church upon this Rock, was upon the Confession of S. Peter, and the solid Faith contained therein. And that Epiphanius could not mean that S. Peter was any Rock or Foundation of the Church, so as that he and his Successors must be relied on in all Matters of Faith, and govern the Church like Princes and Monarchs, he proves not only by the Context, but because he makes S. James to succeed our Lord in the Principality of the Church. And Epiphanius, saith he, was too full of Learning and Industry, to speak contrary to himself in a Point of this Moment. This is the sum of his Lordship's Discourse: To which you answer, That it is clear even by the Texts of Epiphanius, that this Promise by Christ to S. Peter, is derived to his Successors; which you prove from hence, because he saith, That by the*
P. 185. n. 14
P. 204. n. 9. *Gates of Hell, Heresies and Hereticks are understood: now this, say you, cannot be understood of S. Peter's Person alone; for then, Why not Heresies and Hereticks prevail against the Church after S. Peter's Death; yea so far as utterly to extinguish the true Faith? But, Cannot God preserve the Church from being extinguished by Heresies, though S. Peter hath no Infallible Successor? Is not the Promise, That the Gates of Hell shall not prevail against the Church! It doth not say, That the Gates of Hell shall not prevail against any that shall pretend to be his Successors at Rome: For if Heresies be those Gates, they have too often prevailed against them. And, Is this your way indeed to secure the Church, by providing S. Peter such Successors, which may be Hereticks themselves? But much more wisely did S. Gregory say, If one pretends to be Universal Bishop, then upon his falling, the Church must fall too; much more wisely the Council of Basil in their Synodal Epistle, object this as the necessary consequent of the Doctrine of the Pope's Supremacy, that, errante Pontifice, quod sæpe contigit & contingere potest, tota erraret Ecclesia; that, in case the Pope err, which often hath happened, and often may, the whole Church must err too. And yet this is your way to secure the Church from Errors and Heresies. If you designed to ruine it, you could not do it in a more compendious way, than to oblige the whole Church to believe the dictates of one, who is so far from that Infallibility which St. Peter had, that he follows him in nothing more than his Falls: I wish he would in his Repentance too, and that would be the best way to secure the Church from Errors and Heresies. Which she can never be secured from, as long as one pretends to be her Head, who may not only err himself, but propound that to be believed infallibly, which is notoriously false. For that Popes as Popes may err, and propound false*
Doctrines

Doctrine to the Church, not only *Protestants*, but some of your own Communion have abundantly proved; particularly *Sim. Vigarius* in his Defence of *Richerius* in his Commentary on the forecited *Synodal Epistle of the Council of Basil*. And calls that Opinion, That the Pope may err as a private Doctor, but not as Pope, *ineptissimam opinionem*, a most foolish Opinion. For otherwise, as he saith, it would be most absurd to say, That the Pope might be deposed for Heresie; for he is not deposed as a private Doctor, but as Pope. And this he proves by the contradictory Decrees of *Adrian 3.* to *Adrian 1.* and *Leo 7.* and so of *Formosus*, *Martinus*, *Romanus*, to *Johannes*, *Stephanus*, and *Sergius*; Nay, he instanceth in that famous Decree of *Boniface 8.* in pronouncing so definitively, that it was *De necessitate salutis, subesse Romano Pontifici* (necessary to Salvation to be subject to the Pope) and that he decreed this as Pope, appears by those Words, *Declaramus, dicimus, definimus, & pronunciamus, omnino esse de necessitate salutis*; than which Words, nothing can be more express and definitive, and yet Pope *Innocent 3.* asserts, that the King of France hath no Superiour upon Earth. Is not the Churchlike then to be well secured from Heresies, when her *Infallible Heads* may so apparently contradict each other, and this acknowledged by Men of your own Communion? Nothing then can be more absurd or unreasonable, than to say, That the Church cannot be preserved from being extinguished by Heresie, unless the Pope be *S. Peter's Successor*, as Head of the Church. To his Lordship's Testimonies out of *Epiphanius*, that *S. James succeeded our Lord in the Principality of the Church*, you answer, 1. That in the Places he alledges, there's not a Word of the Churches Principality. 2. That he only implies that he was the first of the Apostles made Bishop of any particular Place, viz. at Hierusalem, which is called *Christ's Throne*, as any Episcopal Chair is in ancient Ecclesiastical Writers. But, whosoever will examine the Places in *Epiphanius*, will find much more intended by him, than what you will allow: For not only he saith, that he first had an Episcopal Chair; but that our Lord committed to him *τὴν ἐξουσίαν αὐτῷ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς*, his Throne upon Earth, which surely is much more than can be said of any meer Episcopal Chair; and I believe you will be much to seek where Hierusalem was ever called *Christ's Throne upon Earth* after his Ascension to Heaven. Besides, if it were, it is the strongest Prejudice that may be against the Principality of the Roman See, if Jerusalem was made by *Christ's Throne* here. And, that a Principality over the whole Church is intended by *Epiphanius*, seems more clear by that other Place which his Lordship cites, wherein he not only saith, That James was first made Bishop, but gives this Reason for it, because he was the Brother of our Lord; and if you observe, How *Epiphanius* brings it in, you will say, he intended more by it, than to make him the first Bishop. For he was disputing before, How the Kingdom and the Priesthood did both belong to Christ, and that Christ had transfused both into his Church, *ἰδενται ὅτι ὁ θεὸς ἐν τῇ ἀγίᾳ τῇ θεῷ ἐκκλησίᾳ εἰς τὴν αἰῶνα*, but his Throne is established for ever in his holy Church; consisting both of his Kingdom and Priesthood, both which he communicated to his Church: quare *Jacobus primus omnium est Episcopus constitutus*, as *Petavius* renders it, so that he seems to settle James in that Principality of the Church, which he had given to it; and what Reason can you have to think, but that *Christ's Throne*, in which *Epiphanius* saith, James was settled, in the other Place, is the same with his Throne in the Church which he mentions here? And, What would you give for so clear a Testimony in Antiquity for *Christ's settling S. Peter* in his Throne at Rome, as here is for his placing *S. James* in it at Jerusalem?

His

Vigarius
Com. in ep.
Synod. Con-
cil. Basil. c. 7.
P. 63.

P. 205.

Epiph. heres.
76. P. 1039.

Heres. 19.
P. 119.

Q. 16. His Lordship goes on. *And he still tells us, the Bishop of Rome is S. Peter's Successor. Well, suppose that, What then? What? Why then, he succeeded in all S. Peter's Prerogatives which are ordinary, and belonged to him as a Bishop, though not in the extraordinary, which belonged to him as an Apostle. For that is it which you all say, but no Man proves. Yes, you say, Bellarmine hath done it in his Disputations on that Subject. For this you produce a Saying of his, That when the Apostles were dead, the Apostolical Authority remained alone in S. Peter's Successor. I see with you still, saying and proving are all one. But since you refer the Reader to Bellarmine for Proofs, I shall likewise refer him to the many sufficient Answers which have been given him.*

P. 206. You argue stoutly afterwards, *That because Primacy in the modern Sense of it implies Supremacy, therefore wherever the Fathers attribute a Primacy to Peter among the Apostles, they mean his Authority and Power over them. I see, you are resolved to believe that there cannot be one, two, and three; but the first must be Head over all the rest. A Primacy of Order, his Lordship truly saith, was never denied him by Protestants; and an universal Supremacy of Power was never granted him by the Primitive Christians. Prove but in the first place that S. Peter had such a Supremacy of Power over the Apostles, and all Christian Churches, and that this Power is conveyed to the Pope, you will do something. In the mean time we acknowledge as much Primacy, Authority, and Principality in S. Peter, as D. Reynolds proves in the place you cite, none of which come near that Supremacy of Power which you contend for, and we must deny till we see it better proved than it is by you. But you offer it from S. Hierom, because he saith, The Primacy was given to Peter for preventing Schism, but a meer precedency of Order is not sufficient for that. But, Doth not S. Hierome in the Words immediately before, say, That the Church is equally built on all the Apostles, and that they all receive the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, and that the firmness of the Church is equally grounded on them; and, Can he possibly then mean in the following Words any other Primacy, but such as is among Equals, and not any Supremacy of Power over them? And certainly you think the Apostles very unruly, who would not be kept in Order by such a Primacy as this is, unless S. Peter had full Jurisdiction over them. And since it is so evident, that S. Hierom can mean no other but such a Preheminence as this for preventing Schism, you had need have a good art, that can deduce from thence a necessity of a Supremacy of Power in the Church for that end. For, say you, Whatsoever Power or Jurisdiction was necessary in the Apostle's time for preventing Schisms, must, à fortiori, be necessary in all succeeding Ages; but still be sure to hold to that Power or Jurisdiction which was in the Apostles times, and we grant you all you can prove from it. You still dispute gallantly, when you beg the Question, and argue as formally as I have met with one, when you have supposed that which it most concerned you to prove; Which is, that God hath appointed a Supremacy of Power in one particular Person, always to continue in the Church for Preservation of Faith and Unity in it. For, if you suppose the Church cannot be governed, or Schism prevented without this, you may well save your self a Labour of proving any further. But, so far are we from seeing such a Supremacy of Power as you challenge to the Pope to be necessary for preventing Schisms, that we are sufficiently convinced that the Usurping of it hath caused one of the greatest ever was in the Christian World.*

Reynolds
against Hart.
c. 5. div. 3.

Hieron. l. 1.
Jovin. c. 14.

106:1.D

C H A P. VII.

The Pope's Authority, not proved from Scripture, or Reason.

The Insufficiency of the Proofs from Scripture acknowledged by Romanists themselves. The Impertinency of Luk. 22. 32. to that Purpose. No Proofs offered for it but the suspected Testimonies of Popes in their own Cause. That no Infallibility can thence come to the Pope as St. Peter's Successor confessed and proved by Vigorius and Mr. White. The Weakness of the Evasion of the Pope's erring as a private Doctor, but not as Pope acknowledged by them. John 21. 15. proves nothing towards the Pope's Supremacy. How far the Pope's Authority is owned by the Romanists over Kings. T. C's beggings of the Question, and tedious Repetitions, past over. The Argument from the Necessity of a living Judge, considered. The Government of the Church not Monarchical, but Aristocratical. The Inconveniences of Monarchical Government in the Church manifested from Reason. No Evidence that Christ intended to institute such Government in his Church, but much against it. The Communicatory Letters in the Primitive Church argued an Aristocracy. Gerson's Testimony from his Book de Auferribilitate Papæ, explained and vindicated. St. Hierome's Testimony full against a Monarchy in the Church. The Inconsistency of the Pope's Monarchy with that of Temporal Princes. The Supremacy of Princes in Ecclesiastical Matters, asserted by the Scripture and Antiquity, as well as the Church of England.

WE are now come to the Places of Scripture insisted on for the Proof of the Pope's Authority; which you have been so often and successfully beaten out of, by so many powerful Assaults of our Writers, that it is Matter of Admiration that you should yet think to find any Shelter there. For those which you yet account *Fortresses* and *Bulwarks* for your Cause, have not only been triumphed over by your Adversaries, but have been *sighted* by the wisest of your Party, and deserted as most untenible Places, as I shall make it appear to you in the Progress of this Dispute: In which I shall not barely shew the palpable Weakness of your pretended Proofs, but bring unanswerable Arguments against them from Persons of your own Communion. For the Force of that Reason by which the *Protestants* have prevailed over you in this Dispute hath been so great, that it hath brought over some of the learnedst of your Party, not only to an Acknowledgment of the Insufficiency of these Proofs, but to a zealous Opposition against that very Doctrine which you attempt to prove by them. But such is the Fate of a sinking Cause, that it catcheth hold of any thing to save it self, though it be the *Anchor* of the Ship which makes it sink the sooner. Thus it will appear to be in these *baffled* Proofs, which you only bring into the Field to shew what Streights you are in for help; and no sooner appear there, but they fall off to the conquering side, and help only to promote your Ruine. But since they are in the Place where Arguments should be, we must in Civility consider them, as if they were so. The first Place then is, *Luke 22. 32. I have pray'd for thee that thy faith fail not.* What would a *Philosopher* think, were he chosen as *Umpire* between us, (as once one was between *Origen* and his Adversaries) to hear this Place produced to prove the *Pope's Authority* and *Infallibility*? And when a Reason is demanded of so strange an Inference (from a Promise of *Recovery* to *St. Peter*, to an *impossibility* of falling in the *Pope*) nothing else produced, but the

K k k

forged

forged *Epistles* of some *Popes*, and the partial Testimonies of others in their own Cause? Could he think otherwise, but that these men loved their Cause dearly, and would fain prove it, if they could tell how: But since there was neither Evidence in Reason or more indifferent Writers in it, yet to let them see how confident they were of the *Pope's Infallibility*, they would produce their *Infallible* Testimonies, to prove they were *Infallible*. For we ask, What Evidence is there that the Privilege obtained for St. Peter, whatever it is, must descend to his Successors; if to his Successors, whether to all his Successors, or only to some; if only to some, why to those at Rome more than at Antioch or any other Place; if to them at Rome, why it must be understood of a *Doctrinal* and not a *saving Faith*, as it was in St. Peter; if of *Doctrinal*, why not *Absolutely*, but only *Conditionally*, if they teach the Church? For all these and several other Enquiries of this Nature, we are told, It must be so understood; but if you ask Why, all the Answer we can get is, *Because seven Popes at one time or other said so*.

Q. 2.
P. 208.

Bell. de Pontif.
l. 4. c. 3.

But at this you grow very angry; and tell us, 1. That Bellarmine, besides these, gives several pregnant Reasons from the Text it self. What were it worth, to have a sight of them! If you had thought them so pregnant, you are not so sparing of taking out of Bellarmine, but you would have given them us over again. Bellarmine's excellent Proofs are two or three *sine Dubio's*. *Sine dubio*, saith he, *hic Dominus speciale aliquid Petro impræavit*. And who denies it? But we grant, it was so special to him, that it never came to his Successors; and again, *sine dubio, ipsis præcipue debeat esse nota suæ sedis auctoritas*, speaking of the *Pope's Testimonies* for themselves, Without all doubt they knew best their own Authority. They were wonderfully to blame else; but all the Difficulty is, to perswade others to believe them *sine dubio*, when they speak in their own Cause. And for that I can find no pregnant Reason in him at all. Well, but we have a third *sine dubio* yet, which may be more to the Purpose than either of the other two. For Bellarmine distinguishes of two Privileges which Christ obtained for St. Peter, the first is, That himself should never lose the true Faith though he were tempted of the Devil; and this his Lordship grants, that it was the special Grace which Christ's Prayer obtained, that, notwithstanding Satan's sifting him, and his threefold Denial of his Master, he should not fall into a final Apostasy: The second Privilege is, That he, as Bishop, should not be able to teach any thing against the Faith, *sive*, ut in sede ejus nunquam inveniretur qui doceret contra veram fidem, or, that there should be none found in his See who should do it. Is not here an excellent Conjunction disjunctive in this *Sive*? Or, that he should not do it himself, or, that his Successors should not do it? Doth not this want pregnant Proofs? And we have them in the next Words. The first of these, it may be (very modestly!) did not descend to his Successors; but secundum, *sine Dubio*, manavit ad posteros five Successores; the second, without all doubt, did descend to his Successors. Are not these pregnant Reasons; three *sine dubio's* given us by Cardinal Bellarmine? For when he comes to confirm this last *sine dubio*, he produces nothing but those Testimonies, which his Lordship excepts against, as not fit to be Judges in their own Cause. If these then be Bellarmine's pregnant Reasons out of the Text, no wonder that his Lordship was not pleased to Answer them. But yet you are displeased, that his Lordship should think that *Pope's* were interested Persons in their own Cause. No, no; all that ever sat in that See, were such holy, meek, humble, self-denying men, that they would not for a World, let a Word fall to exalt their own

Authority

Authority in the Church. And we are mightily to blame to think otherwise of them. Is it possible to think that *Felix I.* and *Lucius I.* should speak for their own Interest ; though the *Epistles* under their Names be such notorious Counterfeits, that all sober Men among you are ashamed of them ? It is possible that *Leo I.* should do it, who was so humble a Man, that he contended with 630 *Bishops* of the Council of *Chalcedon* about the Primacy of his See ; and whose *Epistles* breath so much of *Self-denial* in all the Contests he had about it ? And although *Pope Agatho* and the rest be of later standing, when the *Popes* did begin a little more openly to take upon them ; yet, Can the *Protestants* think that these men were *byassed* with their proper Interest ? Are not these weak Pretences for them to reject their Authority upon ? For your part (you say,) you could never understand this Proceeding of *Protestants*. The more a great deal is the Pity ; and if we could help your Understanding and not endanger our own, we would willingly do it. Well, but though *Bellarmino's* pregnant Reasons prove so abortive, and though the *Pope's* Authorities should not be taken, yet his Lordship must needs wrong *Bellarmino*, in saying, That he doth upon the Matter confess, that there is not one Father in the Church disinterested in the Cause, who understands this Text as *Bellarmino* doth, before *Theophylact*. And the reason is, because, though *Bellarmino* cite no more, yet there might be more for all that : for, must he needs confess, there are no more Authors citable in any Subject, but what he cites himself ? As though *Bellarmino* were wont to leave out any Authorities which made for his Purpose, especially in so weighty a subject as this ? Do you think he was so weak a Person to run to *Pope's* Authorities, if he could have found any other ? And when he produces no more, is it not a plain Confession he found no more to his Purpose ? But I am weary of such great Impertinencies ; and would fain meet with some Thing of Matter that might hold up the Readers Patience as well as mine. All that ever I can meet with, that hath any Thing of Tendency that way, is, That this Privilege of the Indeficiency of *St. Peter's Faith* doth not belong to him as an *Apostle*, but rather as he was Prince of the *Apostles*, and appointed to be *Christ's Vicar on Earth* after him. Very handsomly begged again ! But where is the Proof for all this ? Have you no *Popes* stand ready again to attest the Truth of it ? For none else that have any Reason would ever say it ? Did *St. Peter* deny *Christ* as Prince of the *Apostles* ? Indeed it was then much for his Honour that the *Captain* should fly from his Colours first : and *Christ's Vicar upon Earth* should the most need to have his Faith prayed for, that it should not fail ? I had thought *St. Peter* had been Head of the *Apostles*, and not *Simon* : If *Christ* had spoke to him as his *Vicar*, he would sure have call'd him *Peter, Peter*, and not *Simon, Simon*. But it seems he did not attend, that *Peter* was the Rock, on which his Church must be built : Or else he minded it so much, that he thought that Name improper when he mentions his falling : You have therefore stoutly and unanswerably (not proved, but) demonstrated that these Words were spoken of *St. Peter*, not as an *Apostle*, but as *Christ's Vicar upon Earth*.

But suppose it were so ; what is this to those who pretend to be his Successors ? Yes very much. For (say you), Whatever our Saviour intended should descend by Virtue of that Prayer of his, did effectively so descend. You might have put one of *Bellarmino's* *sine dubio's* to this. For, Whoever was so senseless as to question that ? But you confess, It is a very disputable Question, Whether every thing which *Christ* by his Prayer intended and obtained for *St. Peter*, was likewise intended by him to descend to *St. Peter's Successors*. Tet that some special Privilege was to descend to them, is, you say, manifest by

K k k 2

Bellarmino's

P. 209.

Q. 3.

Bellarmino's *Authorities and Reasons*. If from nothing else, I dare confidently say, No Man in his Wits will believe it manifest. And what that is, neither you, nor any one else can either prove or understand. Yes (say you) it is, that none of his Successors should ever so far fall from the Faith, as to teach Heresie, in Pontificalibus, or, as you speak with Bellarmine, any thing contrary to Faith tanquam Pontifex; i. e. in Virtue of that Authority which they were to have in the Church as St. Peter's Successors. Here then we fix a while to see this proved; but our Expectation is again frustrated: For instead of Proofs we meet with the old *Mumpsimus*, of the Pope's erring as private Doctor, but not as Pastor of the Church: A Distinction so ridiculous, that many among your selves deride it, as will appear presently. And therefore put in your *tanquam Pontifex* as long as you please, you will gain no great Matter by it. When you can prove that Christ did intend in that one Prayer, some part of the Gift personally and absolutely to St. Peter, and another part conditionally to his Successors, I will grant it no Absurdity to say, that perhaps some part of the Gift did not belong to either of them. But these are such strange Fetches out of a plain Scripture, that those may admire your Subtilty, who cannot be convinced by your Reason. Yet to let you see that these Things are not so clear as you would have them, I shall bring you some Arguments out of your own Writers against your Interpretation of this Place, and I pray Answer them at your Leisure. Vigorius therefore proves that this Place cannot be understood of St. Peter and his Successors, that their Faith should not fail; for then saith he, 1. *The Canons had decreed to no purpose that a Pope might be deposed in Case of Heresie; for those that suppose that he may fall into Heresie, do doubtless suppose that his Faith fails.* Now here is a Witness against you, from your own Church and that out of your Canons too; and that is better worth than twenty Testimonies of Popes for you. 2. If this were understood of St. Peter's Successors, they who succeeded him at Antioch would enjoy this Privilege as well as those at Rome; for they are, saith he, as well St. Peter's Successors as the other. And, saith he, if they understand this of one and not of the other, *totis faucibus se deridendos propinarent*, they expose themselves to contempt and laughter. 3. If this were true of St. Peter's Successors at Rome, then the Decrees of one Pope could not be revoked by the other; because, it is impossible they should err in making those Decrees. But it is not Vigorius alone who hath shewed the Weakness of your Arguments from this Place; for our learned Countryman Mr. White hath more fully and largely discovered the Weakness of all your Pretences from Scripture, Fathers, and Reason, concerning the Pope's succeeding St. Peter in his Infallibility. And particularly as to this Place he saith, *That either it concerns the present Danger St. Peter was in, or else doth represent what was to be afterwards in the Church; and that it doth primarily and directly relate to St. Peter's imminent Tentation, all the Circumstances perswade us; first, Because he is called by his private Name Simon, and not by his Apostolical Name Peter. 2. Because Christ immediately subjoyns after St. Peter's Answer his threefold Denial of him. 3. The Event it self makes it appear, by the Apostles Flight, S. Peter's Temptation and Fall, his Conversion and Tears when Christ looked on him; and by his confirming the Disciples after Christ's Resurrection.* But saith he), if this Place be taken as respecting the future times of the Church, the same thing must be expected in S. Peter's Successors, which fell out in S. Peter himself, viz. that either through Fear, or some other Motive they may be drawn into the shew of Heresie, or into Heresie it self; but so, as either in themselves or their Successors, they should be restored to the Catholick Faith. But what Reason there

P. 110.

Comment. in ep.
Synod. Concil.
Basil. c. 7.
sect. 3.

Tabula Suffr.
tab. 10. p. III.

is for this latter Interpretation (though destructive to the Pope's Infallibility) neither doth that Person acquaint us, nor can I possibly understand. All the Evasion that you have to avoid the Force of whatever is brought against you out of this Place, is by conjuring up that rare Distinction of the Pope's *not erring when he defines any thing as matter of Faith*. But see what that same Person saith of this Distinction of yours, *Excipiunt aliqui*, saith he, *Papam posse esse hæreticum, sed non posse hæresim promulgare. Adeo quidlibet effutire pro libidine, etiam licitum est.* Some Answer, that the Pope may be a Heretick, but cannot promulge or define Heresie. So far do Men think it lawful to say what they please. But can any Man, saith he, be guilty of so much Incogitancy, as not to see that these things are consequent upon each other; It is a Pear-tree, and therefore it will bear Pears: It is a Vine, and therefore it will bring forth Grapes. Christ saith, *An evil Tree cannot bring forth good fruit; but these say, An evil Tree cannot bring forth bad fruit.* The Apostle saith, *The Wisdom of the Flesh cannot be subject to God; but these say, It cannot but be subject to God.* And then he further presseth, *That they would declare from what Author they brought this Contradiction into the Church of God, lest Men should believe they were inspired by the Father of Lyes when they made it.* Nay he goes further yet in these stinging Expressions, *An putatis licere, in re quæ totum Ecclesiæ statum ad vitium tangit, novitatem adeo inauditam, adeo rationi adversantem, adeo excedentem omnem fidem, ex somniis cerebri vestri inferre?* Do you think it lawful, in a matter which toucheth the whole State of the Church to the quick, to produce so unheard of a Novelty, so repugnant to Reason, so far above all Faith, out of the Dreams of your own Brain? Go now, and answer these Things among your selves? complain not that we account such Evasions silly, absurd, and ridiculous; you see they are accounted so by some of your own Communion (or, at least, who pretend to be so) and those no contemptible Persons neither. But such as have seen so much of the Weakness and Absurdity of your common Doctrine, that they openly and confidently oppose it, and that upon the same Grounds that Protestants had done it before them. And I hope, this is much more to our purpose to shew the Insufficiency of these Proofs, than it was for you to produce the Testimonies of several Popes in their own Cause. Which was all the Proof that Bellarmine or you had, that these Words are extended to St. Peter's Successors, when we bring Men from among your selves, who produce several Reasons, that they ought not to be so interpreted.

But yet there is another place as pertinent as the former; the celebrated *Pasce oves & agnos*, John 21. 15, 16, 17. But Sheep and Lambs, say you, are Christ's whole Flock. So there are both these, saith his Lordship, in every flock that is not of barren Wethers; and every Apostle, and every Apostles Successor hath Charge to feed both Sheep and Lambs; that is, weaker and stronger Christians, not People and Pastors, Subjects and Governours, as A. C. expounds it, to bring the necks of Princes under the Roman Pride. No (say you) no such Charge is given to any other Apostles, in the Places his Lordship cites, Matth. 28. 19. Matth. 10. 17. for these speak of Persons unbaptized, but that place of S. John, of those who were actually Christ's Flock; and the Words being absolutely and indefinitely pronounced, must be understood generally and indefinitely of all Christ's Sheep and Lambs, that is, of all Christians whatsoever, not excepting the Apostles themselves; unless it appear from some other place, that the other Apostles had the feeding of all Christ's sheep, as universally and unlimitedly committed to them, as they were here to S. Peter. But all this is nothing, as Vigorius speaks about the *solvere, ligare, pascere*, but

Tabul. suffrag.
P. 145.

¶ 4.
P. 211.
P. 191.

- go. p. 61. but *dudum explosis cantilenis aures Christianorum obtundere*, to bring us those things over and over, which have been answered as oft as they have been brought. For how often have you been told, that these Words contain no particular *Commission* to *S. Peter*, but a more vehement *Exhortation* to the discharge of his Duty, and that pressed with the quickness of the Question before it, *Lovest thou me?* How often, that the full *Commission* to the *Apostles* was given before? *As the Father hath sent me, so send I you.* And that, as *Christ* was by his Father's Appointment the chief *Shepherd* of the *Sheep* and *Lambs* too; so *Christ* by this equal *Commission* to all the *Apostles* gives them all an equal Power and Authority to govern his *Flock*: How often, that nothing appears consequent upon this, whereby *St. Peter* took this Office upon him? But that afterwards we find *St. Peter* call'd the *Apostle of the Circumcision*, which certainly he would never have been, had he been looked on as the *Universal Pastor of the Church*; we find the *Apostles* sending *St. Peter* to *Samaria*, which was a very unmannerly Action, if they looked on him as *Head of the Church*. How often, that these indefinite Expressions are not exclusive of the *Pastoral Charge* of other *Apostles* over the *Flock of Christ*? When they are not only bid to *preach the Gospel to every Creature*, but even those *Bishops* which they ordained in several Churches are charged to *feed the Flock*; and therefore certainly the *Apostles* themselves had not only a charge to Preach to unbaptized Persons (as you suppose) but to govern the *Flock* of those who were actually *Christ's Sheep and Lambs*, as well as *St. Peter*? How often, I say, have you been told all these and several other things in Answer to this Place; and have you yet the Confidence to object it, as though it had never been taken notice of, without ever offering to take off those Answers which have been so frequently given? But you must be pardoned in this, as in all other things of an equal Impossibility.
- John 20. 21. Gal. 2. 7. Acts 8. 14. Mark 6. 16. Acts 20. 28.
 ¶ 5. Well, but his Lordship objects a shrewd Consequence from this Universal Pastorship; that this brings the Necks of Princes under the Roman Pride. And if Kings be meant, (his Lordship saith) yet the Command is, *pascere, feed them*; but *deponere, or occidere, to depose or kill them, is not pascere in any Sense*; *Lanii id est, non Pastoris, that's the Butchers, not the Shepherd's part.* This, you call, his Lordship's winding about, and falling upon that odious Question of killing and deposing Kings. An odious Question indeed, whether we consider the Grounds, or the Effects and Consequents of it. But yet you would seem to clear your selves from the odium of it. First, By saying that it is a gross Fallacy to argue à negatione speciei ad negationem generis, which is a new kind of Logick. It is indeed, for it is of your own coyning; for his Lordship argues *ab affirmatione generis ad affirmationem speciei*, and I hope this is no new Logick, unless you think he that saith, He who hath Power over all living Creatures, hath not thereby Power over Men too. His Lordship therefore doth not argue against the Pope's Universal Supremacy from the denial of that, but deduces that as a Consequence from your Assertion, and Explication of what you mean by *Sheep and Lambs*. But this is but a slight Answer in Comparison of what follows: Secondly, we answer, That the Point of Killing Kings, is a most false and scandalous Imputation; scandalous enough indeed, if false: and though your Popes have not given express Warrant for the doing it, yet it is sufficiently known, How the Pope in Consistory could not contain his Joy when it was done: in the case of *Henry 3. of France*. And it hath been sufficiently confessed and lamented by Persons of your own Communion, How much the Doctrine of the *Jesuits* hath encouraged
- John 20. 21. P. 191. Ibid. P. 212.

raged those *Assassinations* of those two successive *Henries* of *France*. Will you, or dare you vindicate the Doctrines of *Mariana*, and others, which do not obscurely deliver their Judgment, as to that very thing of *Killing Heretical Princes*? But if we should grant you this, That the Pope may not command to *Kill*, What say you to that of *deposing Princes*? which seldom falls much short of the other? As to this, you dare not cry, It is a false and scandalous Imputation, as you did to the other; but you answer, 'Tis no Point of your Faith, that the Pope hath Power to do it; and therefore you say it is no part of your Task to dispute it. Is this all the Security *Princes* have from you, that it is no Point of your Faith, that the Pope hath Power to do it? Is it not well enough known, that there are many things which are held undoubtedly by the greatest part of your Church, which yet you say, are no Points of Faith? And yet in this you are directly contradicted by one who knew what were Points of Faith among you, as well as you, and that was *Father Creswell*; whose Testimony I have cited already; and he saith expressly, *Certum est, & de fide*, It is a thing certain, and of Faith: that the Subjects of an Heretical Prince, are not only freed from Allegiance, but are bound, ex hominum Christianorum dominatu ejicere, to cast him out of his Power, which certainly is more than the deposing of him. And *Sanders* plainly enough saith, That a King that will not submit to the Pope's Authority, is by no Means to be suffered, but his Subjects ought to do their utmost endeavour that another may be placed in his Room. Indeed, he saith not, as the other doth, That this is *de fide*, but that is the only reserve you have when a Doctrine is odious and infamous to the World, to cry out, It is not *de fide*, when yet it may be as firmly believed among you, as any that you account *de fide*. And if you believe the Duke of *Alva* in his *Manifesto* at the Siege of *Pampelona*, when the Pope had deposed the King of *Navarre* to whom that City belonged, he saith, That it is not doubted but the Pope had Power to depose Heretical Princes. And if you had been of another Opinion, you ought to have declared yourself more fully than you do. If you had said, that indeed some were of that Opinion, but you abhorred and detested it, you had spoken to the purpose; but when you use only that pitiful Evasion, That it is not of Faith, &c. you sufficiently shew, What your Judgment is, but that you dare not publickly own it. It seems, you remember what was said by your Masters in reference to *Emanuel Sà*, non fuit opus ad ista descendere. There was no need to meddle with those things. It seems, if there had been, there was no hurt in the Doctrine, but only that it was unseasonable. I pray God keep us from that time, when you shall think it needful to declare your selves in this Point. But you conclude this with a most unworthy and scandalous Reflection on Protestants, in these Words; But what Protestants have both done and justified in the worst of these kinds, is but too fresh in Memory. But, were those the Practices and Principles of Protestants? Were they not abhorred and detested in the highest manner by all true Protestants, both at Home and Abroad? It will be well, if you can clear some of your selves from having too much a Hand in promoting both those Principles and Practices. I suppose you cannot but have heard, Who it was is said to have expressed so much Joy at the time of that horrid Execution; What Counsels and Machinations are said to have been among some devoted Sons of the Church of Rome abroad about that time: Therefore clear your selves more than yet you have done, of those Imputations, before you charge that guilt on Protestants, which they express the highest Abhorrence of. And let the Names of such who either publickly or privately

Philipator.
sect. 157. p.
149.

De visib. Monarch. l. 2. c. 4.

Nebriſſenſ. de bello Navarr. l. 1. c. 6.

privately abet or justifie such horrid Actions, be under a continual *Anathema* to all Generations.

§. 6.

P. 191. n. 18.

After all this Discourse about the *Pope's Authority*, A. C. brings it at last home to the business of *Schism*. For, he saith, *The Bishop of Rome shall never refuse to feed and govern the whole Flock in such sort, as that neither particular Man nor Church shall have just cause, under Pretence of Reformation in Matters of Faith, to make a Separation from the whole Church.* This (his Lordship saith) by A. C's Favour, is meer begging the Question. For this is the very thing which the Protestants charge upon him; namely, that he hath governed, if not the whole, yet so much of the Church as he hath been able to bring under his Power, so as that he hath given too just cause of the present continued Separation. And, as the Corruptions in the Doctrine of Faith, in the Church of Rome, were the cause of the first Separation; so are they at this present Day, the cause why the Separation continues. And the Oppression of the Church of Rome, he further adds, is the great cause of all the Errors in that part of the Church which is under the Roman Jurisdiction. And for the Protestants, they have made no Separation from the General Church properly so called, but their Separation is only from the Church of Rome, and such other Churches, as by adhering to her, have hazarded themselves, and do now mis-calculate themselves the whole Catholick Church. Nay, even here the Protestants have not left the Church of Rome in her Essence, but in her Errors; not in the Things which constitute a Church, but only in such Abuses and Corruptions, as work towards the Dissolution of a Church. Let now any indifferent Reader be judge, Whether his Lordship, or A. C. be the more guilty in begging the Question. For all the Answer you can give, is, *That his Lordship begs it, in saying that the Roman Church is not the whole Catholick Church, and that the Roman Catholick Church may be in an Error*; but the former we have proved already, and I doubt not but the latter will be as evident as the other, before our Task be ended. But, as though it were not possible for you to be guilty of *begging the Question*, after you have said that the Roman Church cannot err, you give this as the reason for it, *Because she is the unshaken Rock of Truth; and that she hath the sole continual Succession of lawfully sent Pastors and Teachers, who have taught the same unchanged Doctrine, and shall infallibly continue so teaching it to the World's end.* Now, Who dares call this *Begging the Question*? No, it must not be called so in you, it shall be only *Taking it for granted*. Which we have seen, hath been your Practice all along, especially when we charge your Church with Error; for then you cry out presently, *What, your Church err?* No, you defie the Language. *What, the Spouse of Christ, the Catholick Church err?* that is impossible. *What, the unshaken Rock of Truth to sink into Errors?* the *Infallible Church* be deceived? She that hath never taught any thing but Truth, be charged with Falshood? She, that not only never did err, but, it is impossible, nay, utterly impossible, nay, so impossible, that it cannot be imagined, that ever she should err? This is the sum of all your Arguments, which, no doubt, sound high to all such who know not what confident begging the Question means, or, out of Modesty, are loth to charge you with it.

P. 212.

Much to the same purpose do you go on, to prove, *that Protestants have separated not from the Errors, but the Essence of your Church.* And if that be true, which you say, *That those Things which we call Errors are essential to your Church*, we are the more sorry for it; for we are sure, (and, when you please, will prove it) that they are not, cannot be, essential to a true Church; and if they be to yours, the case is so much the worse with you,

when

when your Distempers are in your Vitals, and your Errors essential to your Church's Constitution. What other things you have here, are the bare Repetitions of what we have often had before in the Chapters you refer us to. And here we may thank you for some ease you give us in the far greatest remaining part of this Chapter, which consists of tedious Repetitions of such things which have been largely discussed in the *First part*, where they were purposely and designedly handled; as that concerning *Traditions*, chap. 6. that concerning *Necessaries to Salvation*, chap. 2, 3, 4. that concerning the *Scriptures being an Infallible Rule*, throughout the Controversie of *Resolution of Faith*; and that which concerns the *Infallibility of General Councils*, we shall have occasion at large to handle afterwards; and if there be any thing material here, which you omit there, it shall be fully considered. But I know no Obligation lying upon me to answer things as often as you repeat them, especially since your Gift is so good that way. It is sufficient that I know not of any material Passage, which hath not received an Answer in its proper place.

That which is most pertinent to our present purpose, is that which concerns the necessity of a Living Judge, besides the Scriptures for ending Controversies of Faith. As to which his Lordship saith, *That, supposing there were such a one, and the Pope were he, yet that is not sufficient against the Malice of the Devil, and impious Men, to keep the Church at all times from renting even in the Doctrine of Faith, or to soder the Rents which are made. For, oportet esse Hæreses, Cor. 11. 19. Hæreses there will be, and Hæreses there properly cannot be but in the Doctrine of Faith.* To this you answer, *That Hæreses are not within, but without the Church, and the Rents which stand in need of sodering, are not found among the true Members of the Church, who continue still united in the Faith, and due Obedience to their Head; but in those who have deserted the true Church, and either made or adhered to Schismatical and Heretical Congregations.* A most excellent Answer! His Lordship says, *If Christ had appointed an Infallible Judge besides the Scripture, certainly it should have been for preventing Hæreses, and sodering the Rents of the Church. So it is (say you) for if there be any Hæreses, it is nothing to him, they are out of the Church; and if there be any Schisms, they are among those who are divided from him: That is, he is an Infallible Judge only thus far, in condemning all such for Hereticks and Schismatics, who do not own him. And his only way of preventing Hæreses and Schisms, is the making this the only trial of them, that whatever questions his Authority, is Hæresie; and whatever Separation be made from him, is Schism.* Just as *Abalom* pretended that there was no Judge appointed to hear and determine Causes, and that the Laws were not sufficient without one, and therefore he would do it himself; so doth the Pope by Christ, he pretends that he hath not taken care sufficient for deciding Controversies in Faith, therefore there is a necessity in order to the Churches Unity, he should take it upon himself. But now, if we suppose in the former case of *Abalom*, that he had pretended he could infallibly end all the Controversies in Israel, and keep all in Peace and Unity; and yet abundance of Controversies to arise among them by what Right and Power he took that Office upon him, and many of them cry out upon it, as an Usurpation, and a Disparagement to the Laws and Government of his Father David; and upon this, some of the wiser Israelites should have asked him, Whether this were the way to end all Controversies, and keep the Nation in Peace? Would it not have been a satisfactory Answer for him to have said, Yes, no doubt it is the only way; For, only they that acknowledge my Power, are the King's lawful

N. 3.

N. 8.

N. 57.

Q. 7.

P. 198. n. 6.

P. 218.

2 Sam. 15. 2.

Subjects, and all the rest are Rebels and Traytors. And, Is not this just the same Answer which you give here? *That the Pope is still appointed to keep Peace and Unity in the Church, because all that question his Authority, be Hereticks and Schismatics.* But, as in the former case, the surest way to prevent those Consequences, were to produce that Power and Authority which the *King* had given him, and that should be the first thing which should be made evident from authentick Records, and the clear Testimony of the gravest *Senators*; so, if you could produce the *Letters Patents*, whereby *Christ* made the *Pope* the great *Lord Chancellor* of his *Church*, to determine all *Controversies* of *Faith*, and shew this attested by the concurrent Voice of the *Primitive Church*, who best knew what Order *Christ* took for the Government of his *Church*; this were a way to prevent such Persons turning such *Hereticks* and *Schismatics*, as you say they are, by not submitting themselves to the *Pope's Authority*. But for you to pretend that the *Pope's Authority* is necessary to the *Church's Unity*, and when the *Heresies* and *Schisms* of the *Church* are objected, to say, That those are all out of the *Church*, is just as if a *Shepherd* should say, That he would keep the whole *Flock* of *Sheep* within such a *Fold*, and when the better half are shewed him to be out of it, he should return this Answer, That those were without, and not within his *Fold*; and therefore they were none of the *Flock* that he meant. So that his meaning was, *those that would abide in, he could keep in, but for those that would not, he had nothing to say to them.* So it is with you, the *Pope* he ends *Controversies*, and keeps the *Church* at *Unity*; How so? They who do agree, are of his *Flock*, and of the *Church*; and those that do not, are out of it. A *Quaker* or *Anabaptist* will keep the *Church in Unity* after the same way, only the *Pope* hath the greater Number of his side; for, they will tell you, If they were hearkened to, the *Church* should never be in *Pieces*; for all those who embrace their *Doctrines*, are of the *Church*, and those who do not, are *Hereticks* and *Schismatics*. So we see upon your Principles, What an easie matter it is to be an *Infallible Judge*, and to end all *Controversies* in the *Church*; that only this must be taken for granted, that all who will not own such an *infallible Judge*, are out of the *Church*, and so the *Church* is at *Unity* still, how many soever there are who doubt or deny the *Pope's Authority*. Thus we easily understand what that excellent Harmony is, which you cry so much up in your *Church*; that you most gravely say, *That, had not the Pope received from God the Power he challenges, he could never have been able to preserve that Peace and Unity in Matters of Religion, that is found in the Roman Church*: Of what nature that *Unity* is, we have seen already: And surely you have much cause to boast of the *Pope's Faculty* of deciding *Controversies*, ever since the late *Decree* of *Pope Innocent*, in the case of the *five Propositions*. For, How readily the *Jansenists* have submitted since, and what *Unity* there hath been among the dissenting Parties in *France*, all the *World* can bear you witness. And, whatever you pretend, were it not for *Policy* and *Interest*, the *Infallible Chair* would soon fall to the *Ground*; for it hath so little footing in *Scripture* or *Antiquity*, that there had need be a watchful Eye, and strong Hand to keep it up.

2. 9.

But now we are to examine the main Proof which is brought for the necessity of this *Living and Infallible Judge*; which lies in these Words of *A. C.* Every earthly Kingdom, when Matters cannot be composed by a Parliament (which cannot be called upon all Occasions) hath, besides the Law Books, some living Magistrates and Judges, and above all one visible King, the highest Judge, who hath Authority sufficient to end all *Controversies*, and settle *Unity*

in

in all Temporal Affairs. And, Shall we think that Christ, the wisest King, hath provided in his Kingdom the Church, only the Law Books of holy Scripture, and no living visible Judges, and above all one chief, so assisted by his Spirit, as may suffice to end all Controversies for Unity and Certainty of Faith? which can never be, if every Man may interpret Holy Scripture, the Law Books, as he list. This, his Lordship saith, is a very plausible Argument with the many; but the Foundation of it is but a Similitude, and, if the Similitude hold not in the main, Argument is nothing. And so his Lordship at large proves that it is here. For whatever further concerns this Controversie concerning the Pope's Authority, is brought under the Examination of this Argument; which you mangle into several Chapters, thereby confounding the Reader, that he may not see the Coherence or Dependence of one thing upon another. But having cut off the Superfluities of this Chapter already, I may with more Conveniency reduce all that belongs to this matter within the compass of it. And that he may the better apprehend his Lordship's Scope and Design, I shall first sum up his Lordship's Answers together, and then more particularly go about the Vindication of them.

1. Then, his Lordship at large proves that the *Militant Church is not properly a Monarchy*, and therefore the Foundation of the Similitude is destroyed.
2. That supposing it a Kingdom, yet the Church Militant is spread in many earthly Kingdoms, and cannot well be ordered like one particular Kingdom.
3. That the Church of England under one Supreme Governour, our Gracious Sovereign, hath, besides the Law Book of the Scripture, visible Magistrates and Judges, Arch-Bishops and Bishops to govern the Church in Truth and Peace.
4. That as in particular Kingdoms there are some Affairs of greatest Consequence as concerning the Statute Laws, which cannot be determined but in Parliament; so in the Church, the making such Canons which must bind all Christians, must belong to a free and lawful General Council. Thus I have laid together the substance of his Lordship's Answer, that the Dependence and Connexion of Things may be better perceived by the intelligent Reader.

P. 199. n. 7.

We come now therefore to the first Answer. As to which his Lordship saith, *It is not certain that the whole Church Militant is a Kingdom*; for they are no mean ones which think, our Saviour Christ left the Church Militant in the Hands of the Apostles, and their Successors, in an Aristocratical, or rather a mixt Government; and that the Church is not Monarchical, otherwise than the Triumphant and Militant make one Body under Christ the Head. And in this Sense indeed, and in this only the Church is a most absolute Kingdom. And the very expressing of this Sense, is a full Answer to all the places of Scripture, and other Arguments brought by Bellarmine to prove, that the Church is a Monarchy. But the Church being as large as the World, Christ thought fittest to govern it Aristocratically, by divers, rather than by one Vice-Roy. And I believe, saith he, this is true. For so it was governed for the first three hundred Years, and somewhat better; the Bishops of those times carrying the whole Business of admitting any new consecrated Bishops or others to, or rejecting them from their Communion. And this, his Lordship saith, He hath carefully examined for the first six hundred Years, even to, and within, the time of S. Gregory the Great. Now to this you answer, 1. That though A. C. urgeth the Argument in a Similitude of a Kingdom only, yet it is of force in any other kind of settled Government, as in a Commonwealth. But by this A. C. seems a great deal the wiser Man, for he knew what he did when he instanced in a Kingdom; for he foresaw that this only would tend to his purpose concerning the Pope's Supremacy; but though there be the same Necessity of

P. 200.

P. 219.

some *Supreme Power* in a *Commonwealth*, yet that would do him no good at all, for all that could be inferred thence, would be the Necessity of a *General Council*. And by this you may see, How little your Similitude will hold any other way than A. C. put it. Therefore, 2. You answer, *That the Government of the Church is not a pure, but a mixt Monarchy*, i. e. *the Supream Government of the Church is clearly Monarchical*, you confess: yet *Bishops within their respective Dioceses and Jurisdictions are spiritual Princes also*, that is, *chief Pastors and Governors of such a part of the Church in their own Right*. How far this latter is consonant to your Principles, I have already examined, but the former is that we dispute now, concerning the *Supreme Government of the Church*, Whether that be *Monarchical* or no, and this is that which his Lordship denies; and, for all that I see, we may continue to do so too, for any Argument you bring to the contrary.

¶ 9.
P. 220.

Although you produce your *Achilles* in the next Paragraph, viz. *that since the Government of one in chief, is by all Philosophers acknowledged for the most perfect*, What wonder is it that *Christ our Saviour thought it fitter to govern the Church by one Vice-Roy, than Aristocratically, or by many, as he would have it?* But, Are you sure *Christ* asked the *Philosophers* Opinions, in establishing a Government in the Church? The *Philosophers* judged truly that of all *Forms of Civil Government*, *Monarchy* was the best, i. e. most conducing to the *Ends of Civil Government*: for the *Excellency* of such things must be measured by their respect to the *Ends*. Now, if we apply this to the *Church*, we must not measure it by such *Ends*, as we fanſie to our selves, or such as are only the ends of meer *Civil Societies*; but all must be considered with a respect to the chief *Design* of him who first instituted a *Church*. And from thence we must draw our Inferences, as to what may tend most to the *Peace and Unity* of it. Now it appearing to be the great *Design* of *Christ*, that *Mankind* should be brought to eternal Happiness, we cannot argue from hence, as to the Necessity of any manner of *Government*, unless one of them hath in it self a greater Tendency to this than another hath. For in *Civil Governments*, the whole *Design* of the *Society*, is the *Civil Peace* of it; but it is otherwise in the *Church*, the main end of it, is to order Things with the greatest *Conveniency* for a *future Life*: Now this being the main end of this *Society*, and no manner of *Government* having in it self a greater Tendency to this than other; It was in the Power of the *Legislator*, to appoint what *Government* he pleased himself. But when we consider that he intended this *Church* of his should be spread all over the World, and this to be his immediate Errand he sent his *Apostles* upon, to preach to every Creature, and to plant Churches in the most remote and distant Places from each other; we cannot have the least ground to fanſie he should appoint an *Universal Monarchy* in his Church of any Government whatsoever. For if we will take that Boldness you put us upon, to enquire, What form is fittest for a *Society* dispersed into all *Parts of the World*, and that are not bound, upon their being *Christians*, to live nearer *Rome*, than *Mexico* or *Japan*; Could any one imagine it would be, to appoint one *Vice-Roy* to superintend his Church at such a place as *Rome* is? Suppose all the *East* and *West-Indies* consisted of *Christian Churches*, What Advantage, in order to the Government of those Churches, could the *Pope's Authority* be? What *Hereses* and *Schisms* might be among them before his Holiness could be acquainted with them? These are therefore very slender and narrow Conceptions concerning *Christ's Institution* of a Government over his *Catholick Church*, as though he should only have regard to these few adjacent parts of *Europe*, without any respect to the good

good of the whole Church. But since we see, *Christ* designed such a Church which might be in most remote and distant Places from each other, and yet at such a Distance might equally promote the main Ends, wherefore they became Churches, it is very unreasonable to think he should appoint one *Vice-Roy* to be *Head* over them all. For which, let us suppose, that *Europe* might be (as the *Eastern Churches* have been) over-run with the *Turkish* Power, and only some few suffering *Christians* left here, and the *Pope* much in the same Condition with the *Patriarch* of *Constantinople*: But on the other side, that *Christianity* should largely spread it self in *China*, and the *East Indies*, and the *Christian Church* flourish in *America*. Could any *Philosopher* think that fixing a *Monarchy* at *Rome*, or elsewhere, were the best way to Govern the *Catholick Church*, which consists of all these *Christian Societies*? For that is certainly the best Government which is suited to all Conditions of that *Society*, which it is intended for; now it is apparent the *Christian Church* was intended to be so *Catholick*, that no one *Vice-Roy* can be supposed able to look to the Government of it. If *Christ* had intended meerly such a Church which should have consisted of such Persons which lay here near about *Rome*, and no others, the Supposition of such a *Monarchy* in the Church would not have been altogether so incongruous (tho' liable to very many Inconveniencies): But when he intended his Religion for the universal good of the World, and that in all Parts of it, without obliging them to live near each other, it is one of the most unreasonable Suppositions in the World, that he should set up a *Monarchical Government* over his *Catholick Church* in such a Place as *Rome* is. But now, if we suppose only an *Aristocratical Government* in the Church under *Christ* as the alone *Supreme Head*; nothing can be more suitable to the Nature of the Church, or the large extent of it, than that is. For where-ever a Church is, there may be *Bishops* to govern it, and other Officers of the Church to over-see the lesser Parts of it, and all join to promote the Peace and Unity of it, which they may with the more ease do, if no one challenge to be *Supreme Head*, to whom belongs the chief Care of the Church. For by this Means they cannot with that Power and Authority redress Abuses, and preserve the Churches Purity and Peace, which otherwise they might have done. So that considering barely the Nature of Things, nothing seems more repugnant to the end for which *Christ* instituted a *Catholick Church*, than such a *Monarchy* as you imagine; and nothing more suitable than an *Aristocracy*? considering that *Christian Churches* may be much dispersed abroad, and that where they are, they are incorporated into that *Civil Society* in which they live (according to the known saying of *Optatus*, *Ecclesia est in republica*, &c.) and therefore such a *Monarchy* would be unsuitable to the civil Governments in which those Churches may be. For it were easie to demonstrate, that such a *Monarchy* as you challenge in the Church, is the most inconvenient Government for it, take the Church in what way, or sense you please; Whether, as to its own Peace and Order, or to its spreading into other Churches, or to the Respect it must have to the *Civil Government* it lives under. And, if we would more largely enquire into these Things, we might easily find, that those which you look on as the great Ends, wherefore *Christ* should institute such a *Monarchical Government* in his Church, are things unsuitable to the Nature of a *Christian Church*; and which *Christ*, as far as we can judge, did never intend to take Care, that they should never be; which are, Freedom from all kind of *Controversies*, and absolute Submission of Judgment to the Decrees of an *Infallible Judge*. We no where find such a State of a *Christian Church*

Church described or promised, where Men shall all be of one Mind (only that Peace and brotherly Love be continued, is that, all Christians are bound to); much less certainly, that this *Unity* should be by a Submission of our Understandings to an *Infallible Judge*, of whom we read Nothing in that Book which persuades us to be *Christians*; and without which Freedom of our Understandings (which this pretended Infallibility would deprive us of) we could never have been Judicious and Rational *Christians*.

§. 10.

But granting that wise Men have thought *Monarchy the best Government in its self*; What is this to the proving, what *Government Christ hath appointed in his Church*? For that is the best Government for the Church; not which *Philosophers* and *Politicians* have thought best, but which our *Saviour* hath appointed in his Word. For he certainly knew best, what would suit with the Conveniences of his Church. And these are bold and insolent Disputes, wherein those of your side argue, *That Christ must have instituted a Monarchy in his Church, because all Philosophers have judged That the most perfect Government*. I need not tell you what these Speeches imply *Christ* to be, if he doth not follow the *Philosopher's* Judgment. Will you give him leave to judge what is fittest for his Church himself? Or do you think he hath not Wisdom enough to do it, unless the *Philosophers* instruct him? Let us therefore appeal to his *Laws* to see what *Government* he hath there appointed. And now I shall deal more closely with you. You tell me, *therein Christ hath appointed this Monarchical Government*. But I may be nearer your Mind, when you will Answer me these following Questions. When, and where did any wise *Legislator* appoint a Matter of so vast Concernment to the good of the *Society*, as the *Supreme Government* of it, and express no more of it in his *Laws*, than *Christ* hath done of this *Monarchical Government of the Church*? Is there not particular Care taken in all *Laws* about that, to express the *Rights of Sovereignty*, to hinder *Usurpations*, to bind all to Obedience, to determine the Way of Succession by Descent or Election? And hath *Christ* instituted a *Monarchy* in his Church and said nothing of all these Things? When the utmost you can pretend to, are some ambiguous Places, which you must have the Power of Interpreting your selves, or they signifie nothing to your Purpose. So that none of the *Fathers*, or the *Primitive Church* for several *Centuries*, could find out such Mysteries in *super hanc Petram, dabo tibi Claves*, and *pasce oves*, as you have done. If such a *Monarchy* had been appointed in the Church, what should we have had more frequent Mention of in the *Records* of the Church, than of this? Where do we meet with any *Histories* that write the Affairs of *Kingdoms* for some Hundreds of Years, and never mention any *Royal Acts* of the *Kings* of them? If *S. Peter's* being at *Rome* had settled the *Monarchy* of the Church there, what more famous Act could have been mentioned in all *Antiquity* than that? What Notice would have been taken by other Churches of him whom he had left his Successor? What Addresses would have been made to him by the *Bishops* of other Churches? What Testimonies of Obedience and Submission; what Appeals and Resort thither? And it is wonderful strange that the *Histories* of the Church should be silent in these grand Affairs, when they report many minute Things, even during the hottest Times of Persecution. Did the Christians conspire together in those Times not to let their Posterity know, Who had the *Supream Government* of the Church then? Or were they afraid the *Heathen Emperors* should be jealous of the *Popes*, if they had understood their great Authority? But then methinks they

they should have carried it however among themselves with all Reverence and Submission to the Pope, and not openly oppose him as soon as ever he began to exercise any Authority, as in the Case of *Victor* and the *Asian Bishops*. But of all things, it seems most strange and unaccountable to me, that *Christ* should have instituted such a *Monarchy* in his *Church*, and none of the *Apostles* mention any thing of it in any of the *Epistles* which they writ, in which are several Things concerning the *Peace* and *Government* of the *Church*: Nay, when there were *Schisms* and *Divisions* in the *Church*, and that on the Account of their Teachers, among whom *Cephas* was one (by that very Name on which *Christ* said he would build his *Church*) and yet no mention of Respect more to him than to any other: No Intimation of what Power *St. Peter* had for the Government of the *Church*, as the *Head* and *Monarch* of it: No References at all made to him by any of the divided Parties of the *Church* at that time: No mention at all of any such Power given him in the *Epistles* written by him, but he writes just as any other *Apostle* did, with great Expressions of Humility; and, as if he foresaw what *Usurpations* would be in the *Church*, he forbids any *Lording it over God's Heritage*, and calls *Christ* the chief *Pastor of the Church*. And this he doth in an *Epistle* not writ to the *Catholick Church*, which had been most proper for him if *Head of the Church*, but only to the dispersed *Jews* in some particular Provinces. Can any one then imagine he should be *Monarch* of the *Church*, and no Act of his, as such, recorded at all of him; but carrying himself with all Humility, not fixing himself as *Head of the Church* in any *Chair*, but going up and down from one Place to another, as the rest of the *Apostles*, for promoting the *Gospel of Christ*. To conclude all; Is it possible to conceive there should be a *Monarch* appointed by *Christ* in the *Church*, and yet the *Apostle* when he reckons upon those Offices which *Christ* had set in the *Church*, speak not one Word of him? He mentions *Apostles*, *Prophets*, *Evangelists*, *Pastors* and *Teachers*; but the Chief of all is omitted, and he to whom the Care of all the rest is committed; and in whose Authority the Welfare, Peace, and Unity of the *Church* is secured. These Things to me seem so incredible, that till you have satisfied my Mind in these *Questions*, I must needs judge this pretended *Monarchy* in the *Church* to be one of the greatest *Figments* ever were in the Christian World. And thus I have at large considered your Argument from *Reason*, Why there should be such a *Monarchy* in the *Church*; which I have the rather done, because it is one of the great Things in dispute between us, and because the most plausible Argument brought for it, is, *The Necessity of it in order to the Church's Peace*, which *Monarchy* being the best of *Governments* would the most tend to promote. To return now to his Lordship.

Eph. 4. 11.

He brings an Evidence out of Antiquity against the Acknowledgement of any such *Monarchy* in the *Church* from the literæ communicatoriæ, which certified from one great *Patriarch* to another, Who were fit or unfit to be admitted to their *Communion*, upon any occasion of repairing from one *See* to another. And these were sent mutually, and as freely in the same manner from *Rome* to the other *Patriarchs*, as from them to it. Out of which (saith his Lordship) I think this will follow most directly, that the *Church Government* then was *Aristocratical*. For had the *Bishop of Rome* been then accounted sole *Monarch* of the *Church*, and been put into the Definition of the *Church* (as he is now by *Bellarmino*) all these communicatory Letters should have been directed from him to the rest, as whose Admittance ought to be a Rule for all to communicate; but not from others to him, at least not in that even equal brotherly way, as now they appear to be written. For it is no way probable the *Bishops of Rome* which

§. II.
P. 201.

P. 220.

which even then sought their own greatness too much, would have submitted to the other Patriarchs voluntarily, had not the very Course of the Church put it upon them. To this you Answer, That these literæ communicatoriæ do rather prove our Assertion, being ordained by Sixtus I. in favour of such Bishops as were called to Rome, or otherwise forced to repair thither; to the end they might without Scruple, be received into their own Diocese at their return: Having also decreed, that without such Letters communicatory, none in such Case should be admitted. But that these Letters should be sent from other Bishops to Rome in such an even, equal, and brotherly way, you say, is one of his Lordship's Chimera's. But this Difference or Inequality you pretend to be in them; that those to the Pope were merely Testimonial; those from him were Mandatory, witness (say you) the Case of St. Athanasius and other Bishops restored by the Pope's communicatory Letters. But supposing them equal, you say, it only shewed the Pope's Humility; and ought to be no Prejudice to his just Authority, and his Right and Power to do otherwise if he saw Cause. But all this depends upon a meer Fiction, viz. That these communicatory Letters were ordained by Sixtus I. in favour of such Bishops as were called to Rome, than which nothing can be more improbable. But I do not say, that this is a Chimera of your

Baron. Annal.
A. D. 142. §. 6.
Bin. Concil.
To. 1. p. 74.

Baron An. 865.
§. 5. 8.

own Brains, for you follow Baronius in it: For which he produceth no other Evidence, but the Author of the *Lives of the Popes*: But Binius adds that which seems to have been the first ground of it, which is the second decretal Epistle of Sixtus I. in which that Decree is extant: But whosoever considers the notorious Forgery of those decretal Epistles (as will be more manifested where you contend for them) on which Account they are slighted by Card. Perron, and in many Places by Baronius himself, will find little Cause to triumph in this Epistle of Sixtus I. And whoever reflects on the State of those Times in which Sixtus lived, will find it improbable enough, that the Pope should take to himself so much Authority to summon Bishops to him, and to order that none should be admitted without Communicatory Letters from him. It is not here a Place to enquire into the several sorts of those Letters which passed among the Bishops of the Primitive Church, whether the Canonical, Pacifical, Ecclesiastical, and Communicatory Letters granted to Travellers, in order to their Communion with foreign Churches, and those Letters which were sent from one Patriarch to another. But this is sufficiently evident, that those Letters which were the *tessera Hospitalitatis*, as Tertullian calls it, the Pass-port for Communion in foreign Churches, had no more respect to the Bishop of Rome, than to any other Catholick Bishop. Therefore the Council of Antioch passeth two Canons concerning them; one, That no Traveller should be received without them; another, That none but Bishops should give them. And that all Bishops did equally grant them to all Places, appears by that Passage in St. Austin, in his Epistle to Eusebius and the other Donatists, relating the Conference he had with Fortunius a Bishop of that Party; wherein St. Austin asked him, Whether he could give Communicatory Letters whither he pleased? For by that Means it might be easily determined whether he had Communion with the whole Catholick Church, or no. From whence it follows, that any Catholick Bishop might without any respect to the Bishop of Rome grant Communicatory Letters to all foreign Churches. And the enjoying of that Communion which was consequent upon these Letters, is all that Optatus means in that known Saying of his, That they had Communion with Siricius at Rome, *commercio formatarum*, by the use of these Communicatory Letters. But besides these, there were other Letters, which every Patriarch

Concil Antioch.
can. 7, 8.

Aug. Epist.
163.

Optat. l. 2.

sent

sent to the rest upon his first Installment, which were call'd their *Synodical Epistles*, and these contained the Profession of their Faith; and the Answers to them did denote their *Communion* with them. Since therefore these were sent to all the *Patriarchs* indifferently; and not barely to the *Bishop of Rome*; there appears no difference at all in the Letters sent to or from him and the other *Patriarchs* on this Occasion. As for your instance of the Pope's restoring Athanasius, I have sufficiently answered it already; and if the Pope's Letter were never so *Mandatory* (as it was not) yet we see it took no effect among the *Eastern Bishops*: and therefore they were of his Lordship's Mind, *That the Government of the Church was not Monarchical, but Aristocratical*. I did expect here to have met with the pretended Epistle of *Atticus of Constantinople*, about the manner of making *formed Letters*, wherein one is said to be for the Honour of *St. Peter*; but since you pass it over, on this occasion, I hope you are convinced of the Forgery of it.

In the beginning of your next Chapter (which because of the Coherence of the matter I handle with this) you find great Fault with his Lordship for a *Marginal Citation* out of Gerson, because he supposeth that Gerson's Judgment was, that the Church might continue without a *Monarchical Head*, because he writ a *Traët de Auferibilitate Papæ*; whereas, you say, Gerson's drift is only to shew how many several ways the Pope may be taken away, that is, deprived of his Office, and cease to be Pope as to his own Person, so that the Church, pro tempore, till another be chosen shall be without her visible Head. But although the Truth of what his Lordship proves, doth not at all depend upon this Testimony of Gerson, which was only a *Marginal Citation*; yet since you so boldly accuse him for a false Allegation, we must further examine how pertinent this Testimony is to that which his Lordship brought it for. The Sentence to which this Citation of Gerson refers, is this. *For they are no mean ones, who think our Saviour Christ left the Church militant in the hands of the Apostles, and their Successors, in an Aristocratical, or rather a mixt Government; and that the Church is not Monarchical, otherwise than the Triumphant and Militant make one Body under Christ the Head*. Over-against these Words, that *Traët of Gerson de Auferibilitate Papæ* is cited. If therefore so much be contained in that Book, as makes good this, which his Lordship says; he is not so much guilty of false alledging Gerson, as you are of falsely accusing him. To make this clear, we must consider what Gerson's design was in writing that Book, and what his Opinion therein is concerning the Church's Government. It is well known, that his Book was written upon the occasion of the Council of Constance in the time of the great Schism between the three Popes; and that the design of it, is, to make it appear that it was in the Power of the Council to depose the Popes, and suspend them from all Jurisdiction in the Church. Therefore, he saith, *That the Pope may not only lose his Office by voluntary Cession; but that in many cases he may be deprived by the Church, or by a General Council representing the Church, whether he consent to it or no*: Nay, in the next Consideration, he saith, *That he may be deprived by a General Council which is celebrated without his Consent or against his Will*; And, in the following Consideration adds, *That this may be done not only declaratively, but juridically*; the Question now comes to this, Whether a Person who asserts these things, doth believe the Government of the Militant Church to be *Monarchical*, and not rather *Aristocratical* and *mixt Government*? And I dare appeal to any Mans Reason, whether that may be accounted a *Monarchical Government*, where he that is *Supreme* may be de-

§. 12.
P. 221.

P. 200.

Gerson de Auferibilitate Papæ Consider.
10.

Spalat. de Rep.
Eccles. Tom. 1.
l. 4. c. 7. sect. 5.

posed and deprived of his Office in a *Juridical* manner, by a Senate that hath Authority to do these things? For it is apparent, the *Supreme Power* lies in the Senate and not the Prince, and that the Prince is only a *Ministerial Head* under them. And this is plainly Gerson's Opinion as to the Church; although therefore he may allow the *supreme Ministerial Authority* to be in the Pope, (which is all your Citations prove) yet the *radical* and *intrinsic Power* lies in the Church, which being represented in a *General Council*, may depose the Pope from his Authority in the Church. And the truth is, this Opinion of Gerson makes the Fundamental Power of the Church to be *Democratical*, and that the *Supreme Exercise* is by *Representatives* in a *General Council*, and that the Pope at the highest, is but a *Ministerial* and *accountable Head*. And therefore Spalatensis truly observes, *That this Opinion of Gerson* (which is the same with that of the *Paris Divines*, of which he speaks) *doth only in Words attribute supreme Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction to the Pope, but in reality it takes it quite away from him*. And this is the same *Doctrine* which then prevailed in the *Council of Constance*, and afterwards at *Basil*, as may be seen at large in their *Synodical Epistle*, defended by *Richerius*, *Vigorius*, and others. Now let any Man of Reason judge, whether, notwithstanding your charge of *false Citation*, (from some Expressions intimating only a *Ministerial Headship*) his Lordship did not very pertinently cite this Tract of Gerson's, to prove *that no mean Persons did think the Church Militant, not to be Governed by a Monarchical, but by an Aristocratical or mixt Government?*

§. 13.
P. 212.

But no sooner is this marginal Citation cleared, but the Charge is renewed about another, *viz. St. Hierom*; yet here you dare not charge his Lordship with a false Allegation, but you are put to your shifts to get off this Testimony as well as you can. For, *St. Hierom* saying expressly in his Epistle to *Evagrius*, *Ubiunque fuerit Episcopus, sive Roma, sive Eugubii, sive Constantinopoli, sive Rhegi, &c. ejusdem meriti est, ejusdem est & sacerdotii*; his Lordship might well infer, *That doubtless he thought not of the Roman Bishops Monarchy*. For what Bishop, saith he, *is of the same Merit or the same degree in the Priesthood with the Pope, as things are now carried at Rome?* To this you Answer, *That he speaks not of the Pope, as he is Pope, or in respect of that eminent Authority, which belongs to him as St. Peter's Successor, but only compares him with another private Bishop, in respect of meer Character or Power of a Bishop, as Bishop only*. But though this be all which any of your Party ever since the Reformation have been able to Answer to this place; yet nothing looks more like a meer shift than this doth. For had *St. Hierom* only compared these Bishops together in regard of their Order, was not *Sacerdotium* enough to express that by? if *St. Hierom* had said only, that all Bishops are *ejusdem sacerdotii*, there might have been some plausible Pretence for this Distinction; but when he adds *ejusdem meriti* too, he wholly precludes the Possibility of your evading that way. For, What doth *Merit* here stand for as distinct from Priesthood, if it imports not something besides what belongs to Bishops as Bishops? What can *Merit* here signifie, but some greater Power, Authority, and Jurisdiction given by *Christ* to one Bishop above another? *S. Hierom* was not so senseless, as not to see that the Bishops of *Rome*, *Constantinople*, and *Alexandria*, had greater Authority, and larger Jurisdiction in the Church, than the petty Bishops of *Eugubium*, *Rhegium*, and *Tanis*; but all this he knew well enough came by the Custom of the Church, that one Bishop should have larger Power in the Church than another. But (saith he) if you come to urge us with what ought to be practised in the Church, then, saith he, *Orbis major est*

est Urbe, it is no one City, as that of *Rome* (which he particularly instanceth in) which can prescribe to the whole World; For (saith he) *all Bishops are of equal Merit, and the same Priesthood, wheresoever they are, whether at Rome or elsewhere.* So that it is plain to all, but such as wilfully blind themselves, that *St. Hierom* speaks not of that, which you call, *The Character of Bishops*, but of the *Authority* of them; for that very Word he useth immediately before, *Si auctoritas quaeritur, orbis major est urbe.* And where do you ever find *Merit* applied to the *Bishop's Character*? They who say, It is understood of the *Merit of good Life*, make *St. Hierom* speak Non-sense. For are all *Bishops* of the same *Merit of good Life*? But we need not go out of *Rome* for the proper Importance of *Merit* here. For in the third Roman Synod under *Symmachus*, that very Word is used concerning Authority and Principality in the Church; *ejus sedi primum Petri Apostoli meritum sive principatus, deinde Conciliorum venerandorum Auctoritas, &c.* where *Binius* confelleth an Account is given of the *Supremacy* of the *Bishop of Rome*, the first ground of which is *S. Peter's Merit or Principality*; apply now but this Sense to *S. Hierom*, and he may be very easily understood, All *Bishops* are *eiusdem meriti sive Principatus*, of the same *Merit, Dignity or Authority in the Church*. But you say, he speaks not of the *Pope*, as he is *Pope*: good Reason for it, for *St. Hierom* knew no such *Supremacy* in the *Pope*, as he now challengeth. And can you think, if *St. Hierom* had believed such an Authority in the *Pope* as you do, he would ever have used such Words as these are, to compare him with the poor *Bishop of Agobio* in *Merit* and *Priesthood*? I cannot perswade my self you can think so, only something must be said for the Cause you have undertaken to defend. And since *Bellarmino*, and such great Men, had gone before you, you could not believe there were any Absurdity in saying as they did. Still you say, *He doth not speak of that Authority which belongs to the Bishop of Rome, as Saint Peter's Successor.* But if you would but read a little further, you might see that *S. Hierom* speaks of all *Bishops*, whether at *Rome*, or *Eugubium*, &c. as equally the *Apostles Successors*: For it is neither (saith he) *Riches or Poverty which makes Bishops higher or lower. Caterum omnes Apostolorum successores sunt*; but they are all the *Apostles Successors*; therefore he speaks of them with relation to that *Authority* which they derived from the *Apostles*. And never had there been greater Necessity for him to speak of the *Popes succeeding S. Peter* in the *Supremacy* over the Church than here, if he had known any such thing, but he must be excused, he was ignorant of it. No, that he could not be (say you again) for he speaks of it elsewhere, and therefore he must be so understood there, as that he neither contradict nor condemn himself. But if the Epistle to *Damasus* be all your Evidence for it, a sufficient Account hath been given of that already; therefore you add more, and bid us go find them out, to see, Whether they make for the Purpose or no. I am sure your first doth not out of his Commentary on the 13 Psalm, because it only speaks of *S. Peter's being Head of the Church*, and not of the *Pope's*, and that may import only *Dignity and Preheminence*, without Authority and Jurisdiction: Besides, that Commentary on the Psalms is rejected as spurious by *Erasmus*, *Sixtus Senensis*, and many others among your selves. Your second, *ad Demetriadem Virginem*, is much less to your Purpose; for that only speaks of *Innocentius* coming after *Anastasius* at *Rome. qui Apostolica Cathedra & supradicti viri successor & filius est, Who succeeded him in the Apostolical Chair*: But, Do you not know that there were many *Apostolical Chairs* besides that of *Rome*, and had every one of them supreme Authority over the Church of God? What that should be on the

Concil. Rom. 3
sub Symmacho
Tr. 3. p. 688.

16 of S. Matthew, I cannot imagine, unless it be that S. Peter is called *Princeps Apostolorum*, which Honour we deny him not, or that he saith *Edificabo Ecclesiam meam super te*: But how these Things concern the Pope's Authority, unless you had further enlightened us, I cannot understand. That ep. 54. *ad Marcellam*, is of the same Nature with the last, for the Words which I suppose you mean, are, *Petrus super quem Dominus fundavit Ecclesiam*; and if you see, what Erasmus saith upon that Place, you will have little Cause to boast much of it. Your last Place is, l. 1. Cont. Lucifer. which I suppose to be that commonly cited thence; *Ecclesie salus in summi Sacerdotis dignitate pendet*; but there even *Marianus Victorius* will tell you, it is understood of every ordinary Bishop. Thus I have taken the Pains to search those Places you nakedly refer us to in S. Hierom, and find him far enough from the least Danger of contradicting or condemning himself, as to any thing which is here spoken by him. So that we see S. Hierom remains a sufficient Testimony against the Pope's Monarchical Government of the Church.

¶ 14.
P. 201.
Optat. l. 3.

P. 223.

His Lordship further argues against this Monarchy in the Church from the great and undoubted Rule given by Optatus; that wheresoever there is a Church, there the Church is in the Commonwealth, and not the Commonwealth in the Church. And so also the Church was in the Roman Empire. Now from this ground (saith his Lordship) I argue thus. If the Church be within the Empire, or other Kingdom, 'tis impossible the Government of the Church should be Monarchical. For no Emperour or King will endure another King within his Dominion, that shall be greater than himself, since the very enduring it makes him that endures it upon the Matter no Monarch. Your Answer to this, is, That these two Kingdoms are of different Natures, the one Spiritual, the other Temporal: the one exercised only in such Things as concern the Worship of God, and the Eternal Salvation of Souls; the other in Affairs that concern this World only. Surely you would persuade us, we had never heard of, much less read Bellarmine's Fifth Book de Pontifice, about the Pope's Temporal Power, which was fain to get Licence for the other Four to pass at Rome; and although he minces the Matter as much as may be, and much more than Baronius and others did, who pleaded downright for the Pope's Temporal Power; yet he must be a very weak Prince, who doth not see how far that indirect and reductive Power, may extend, when the Pope himself is to be Judge, What comes under it, and what not. And, What may not come under it, when deposing of Princes shall be reduced under that you call the Worship of God? And absolving Subjects to their Obedience, tend to promote their Eternal Salvation? But if the Pope may be Judge, What temporal things are in ordine ad spiritualia, and bring them under his Power in that Respect, Why may not the Prince be Judge what spiritual things are in ordine ad temporalia, and use his Power over them in that Respect too? But in the mean time, Is not a Kingdom like to be at Peace then? If the Pope challenged no other Authority but what Christ or the Apostle had, his Government might be admitted, as well as that Authority which they had; but, What do you think of us the mean while, when you would persuade us, that the Pope's Power is no other than what Christ or the Apostles had? You must certainly think us such Persons as the Moon hath wrought particularly upon, as you after very civilly speak concerning his Lordship. Your Instance from the Kings of France and Spain, his Lordship had sufficiently answered, by telling you, That he that is not blind may see if he will, of what little value the Pope's Power is in those Kingdoms, further than to serve their own turns of him, which they do to their great Advantage. And when you would

would have this to be upon the account of Faith and Conscience, let the Pope exercise his Power apparently against their Interest, and then see, on what account they profess Obedience to him. But, as long as they can manage such Pretences for their Advantage, and admit so much of it, and no more, they may very well endure it, and his Lordship be far enough from contradicting himself. When you would urge the same Inconvenience against the Aristocratical Government of the Church, you suppose that Aristocratical Government wholly Independent on, and not subordinate to, the Civil Government; whereas his Lordship and the Church of England assert the King's Supremacy in Government over all, both Persons and Causes Ecclesiastical: And therefore this nothing concerns us. And if from what hath gone before, it must, as you say, remain therefore fully proved, that the external Government of the Church on Earth is Monarchical; It may for all that I see, remain as fully proved, that you are now the Man who enjoy this Monarchical Power over the Church. And whatever you stile the Pope, Whether the Deputy, or Vicar General of Christ, or Servus servorum, or what you will; it is all one to us as long as we know his meaning, whatever fair Words you give him. As though Men would take it one Jot the better to have one usurp and Tyrannize over them, because he doth not call himself King or Prince, but their humble Servant. Is it not by so much the greater Tyranny? to have such kind of Ecclesiastical Saturnalia, when the servus servorum must, under that Name, tyrannize over the whole World?

We have already at large shewed, How destructive this pretended Supremacy is to that Government of the Church by Bishops, which, his Lordship proves from the ancient Canons and Fathers of the Church, doth of right belong to them, viz. from several Canons of the Councils of Antioch and Nice, and the Testimonies of S. Augustine and S. Cyprian. To all this you only say, That you allow the Bishops their Portion in the Government of Christ's Flock: But it is but a very small Portion of what belongs to them, if all their Jurisdiction must be derived from the Pope; which I have shewed before to be the most current Opinion in your Church: And I dare say, you will not dispute the contrary. His Lordship was well enough aware, to what purpose Bellarmine acknowledged that the Government of the Church was ever in the Bishops; for he himself saith, It was to exclude temporal Princes; but then he desires A. C. to take notice of that, when Secular Princes are to be excluded, then it shall be pretended, that Bishops have Power to govern; but when it comes to sharing Stakes between them and the Pope, then Hands off; they have nothing to do any further than the Pope gives them leave. What follows concerning the Impossibility of a Right executing of this Monarchy in the Church hath been already discoursed of, and you answer nothing at all to it that hath any Face of Pertinency; for when you say, it will hold as well against the Aristocratical Form, I have plainly enough shewed you the contrary.

That which follows about the Design of an Universal Monarchy in the State, as well as the Church; about Pope Innocent's making the Pope to be the Sun, and the Emperor the Moon, the Spanish Friars two Scutchions, Campanella's Eclogue, since you will not stand to defend them, I shall willingly pass them over. But what concerns the Supremacy of the Civil Power, is more to our purpose, and must be considered. His Lordship therefore saith, That every Soul was to be subject to the higher Power, Rom. 13. 1. And the higher Power there mentioned, is the Temporal. And the ancient Fathers come in with a full Consent, that every Soul comprehends all without Exception: All spiritual Men, even to the highest Bishop, even in spiritual Causes too, so

P. 224.

P. 202.

P. 224.

P. 15.

P. 225, 227.

P. 205.

the Foundations of Faith and good Manners be not shaken : And where they are shaken, there ought to be Prayer and Patience, there ought not to be Opposition by Force. Nay, Emperors and Kings are custodes utriusque Tabulæ; They to whom the Custody and Preservation of both Tables of the Law, for Worship to God, and Duty to Man, are committed. A Book of the Law was by God's own Command in Moses his time, to be given to the King, Deut. 17. 18. And the Kings under the Law, but still according to it, did proceed to necessary Reformation in Church Businesses; and therein commanded the very Priests themselves, as appears in the Acts of Hezekiah and Josiah, who yet were never censured to this Day for usurping the High-Priest's Office. Nay, and the greatest Emperors for the Churches Honour, Theodosius the elder, and Justinian, and Charles the Great, and divers others, did not only meddle now and then, but enact Laws to the great Settlement and encrease of Religion in their several times. Now to this again you answer, That the Civil and Spiritual are both absolute and independent Powers, though each in their proper Orb, the one in Spirituals, the other in Temporals. But, What is this to that which his Lordship proves, That there can be no such absolute independent Spiritual Power; both because all are bound to obey the Civil Power, and because the Civil Power hath a right to meddle in Ecclesiastical Matters? And, though you express never so much Honour to civil Authority, yet still you limit it to the Administration meerly of civil Affairs: and how far that is, is well enough known. You tell us plainly, That it doth not belong to the Emperor to order the Affairs of the Church; But why do you not answer the Reasons and Instances which his Lordship brings to the contrary? Yet you yield, That in case of notorious and gross Abuses, manifestly contrary to Religion, and connived at by the Pastors of the Church, Christian Princes may lawfully and piously use their Authority, in procuring the said Abuses to be effectually redressed by the said Pastors, as the Examples of Ezekias and Josias prove. But in case the High-Priest would not have yielded to such a Reformation, Might not those Princes, by the assistance of other Priests, have effected it? This is the case you were to speak to: For whereas you fly out, and say, That Princes may not take the Priest's Office upon them; Whom do you dispute against in that? Not his Lordship certainly, nor any of the Church of England, who never said they might, though they have been most injuriously calumniated, as though they did. That which we assert, is, That Princes may enact Laws concerning Religion, and reform Abuses in Divine Worship, but we do not say, they may take the Pastoral Office upon them; and therefore you say no more in that than we do our selves. But when you say, They may not reform Religion in the Substance of it, I cannot well tell how to understand you. If you mean, not so reform Religion, as to take away any of the Substance, that is a Reformation to purpose; but if you bring it *ad hypothesin*, we utterly deny that any of the Substance of Religion was taken away upon our Church's Reformation: If you mean, not reform Abuses, which go under the Name of the Substance of Religion, that will be to make the most unsufferable Abuses the most incurable. But, when you add, That nothing may be enacted pertaining to Religion by their own Authority without, or contrary to the Priest's Consent (the High-Priest, I suppose you mean) shew us, Where the Kings of Israel were bound, not to reform in case the High-Priest did not consent; and if you could do this, you must prove such a High Priest now, and that Princes are bound to wait his Leisure for reforming Abuses in Religion, when his pretended Authority is upheld by maintaining them. As for your Commendations of Pope Hildebrand, and Innocent the third, for very prudent Men, and worthy Champions

Champions of your Church, we see, What *Prudence* is with you, and what a worthy *Church* you have. But it is still an excellent *Evasion*, *That they never endeavoured to subject the Emperor to themselves in temporal Matters*; no nor *Alexander* the Third neither, when he trod upon the *Emperor's* Neck? But the Proceedings of these *Popes* with the *Emperors*, as likewise *Adrian* 4. *Lucius* 3. and others, are so gross, that it had been more for your Interest with *Christian Princes*, to disown them, than to go about to palliate them with such frivolous Distinctions, that his *Understanding* must be as *blind* as his *Obedience*, that doth not see thorough them. You are much concerned, that his Lordship should seem to give a *Lash* to those mortified self denying Men, the *Jesuits*, in bidding them leave their practising to advance the greatness of the *Pope* and *Emperor*; for, Who could believe they should deprive themselves of the *Riches* and *Pleasures* of the *World* upon such *Designs*? Undoubtedly you are one of the Number, for I never heard that any other Order among you, did ever give them half so good Words, but condemned them as much for their practising, as we do our selves. And, What *holy Men* they are, and what excellent *Casuistical* Divinity about both the *Riches* and *Pleasures* of the *World*, if we did not otherwise know, the *Mysteries* of *Jesuitism* would sufficiently discover To what his Lordship saith further, *That there is no necessity of one Supreme Living Judge, to keep the Church in Peace and Unity, but that the several Bishops under their Sovereign Princes, are sufficient in order to it*; you only say, *That he quotes Occham for it*. But, Doth he nothing else but quote *Occham*? Why do you not answer to the thing, and not barely to *Occham*? You have very good reason for it; for you have little to say to the thing it self; but for *Occham*, you have enough to tell him in his Ear. 1. *That he is in the Index of forbidden Books*; a good Testimony for the Man's Honesty. 2. *That he sided with the Emperor*; a Crime beyond an *Index Expurgatorius* at *Rome*. 3. *That if there were such a Government as Occham supposes, all those Governours must be Infallible, or else there would be meer Anarchy in the Church*: And, Why not as well in the *State*, without *Infallibility* there? You say, *For want of this Infallibility, those Countries where it is not acknowledged, are in Schisms*: And we say, The pretence of this *Infallibility* hath caused the greatest of them. 4. You say, *Occham speaks only de possibili, of what might have been, if our Saviour had pleased*; but *Occham* says, *There is no necessity there should be one chief Governour under Christ*, and we say, You can never prove that *Christ* hath appointed that there shall be one; and therefore this is more than disputing a bare Possibility.

But now, as though all your beggings the Question had been Arguments, all your Sayings Proofs, and all your Proofs Demonstrations, with as much Authority as if you were in *Cathedra*, you conclude; *Remain it therefore a settled Catholick Principle, that the Pope hath Power over the whole Church of God*; But you leave out something which should be at the end of it, *among all those who can believe things as strongly without Reason, as with it*. And for the greater Solemnity of the Sentence you give it in the Words of the *Oecumenical Council* at *Florence*: And I must needs say, You have fitted them very well, for that was just as much an *Oecumenical Council*, as the *Pope* is *Oecumenical Pastor*: but, that neither the one nor the other is so, I have sufficiently proved already.

C H A P. VIII.

Of the Council of Trent.

110:FK

The Illegality of it manifested, first from the Insufficiency of the Rule it proceeded by, different from that of the first General Councils, and from the Pope's Presidency in it. The matter of Right concerning it, discussed. In what Cases Superiors may be excepted against as Parties. The Pope justly excepted against as a Party, and therefore ought not to be Judge. The Necessity of a Reformation in the Court of Rome, acknowledged by Roman Catholics. The matter of Fact enquired into, as to the Pope's Presidency in General Councils. Hosius did not preside in the Nicene Council as the Pope's Legat. The Pope had nothing to do in the second General Council. Two Councils held at Constantinople, within two Years; these strangely confounded. The mistake made evident. S. Cyril not President in the third General Council as the Pope's Legate. No sufficient evidence of the Pope's Presidency in following Councils. The justness of the Exception against the place, manifested; and against the freedom of the Council from the Oath taken by the Bishops to the Pope. The form of that Oath in the time of the Council of Trent. Protestants not condemned by General Councils. The Greeks and others unjustly excluded as Schismaticks. The Exception from the small Number of Bishops cleared and vindicated. A General Council in Antiquity not so called from the Pope's General Summons. In what sense a General Council represents the whole Church. The vast difference between the Proceedings in the Council of Nice, and that at Trent. The Exception from the Number of Italian Bishops, justified. How far the Greek Church and the Patriarch Hieremias may be said to condemn Protestants; with an account of the Proceedings between them.

p. 1.

Hist. Council
of Trent. l. 1.
p. 132.

HAVING thus far considered the several Grounds on which you lay the Charge of *Schism* upon us, and shewed at large the Weakness and Insufficiency of them, we should now have proceeded to the last part of our Task, but that the great *Palladium* of the present Roman Church, viz. the Council of Trent, must be examined, to see whether it be *Διοικησις*, or no; whether it came from Heaven, or was only the Contrivance of some cunning Artificers. And the famous Bishop of Bitonto in the Sermon made at the opening the Council of Trent, hath given us some ground to conjecture its Original by his comparing it so ominously to the *Trojan-Horse*. Although therefore that the Pretences may be high and great, that it was made *Divina Palladis arte*, the Spirit of God being said to be present in it, and concurring with it, yet they who search further will find as much of *Artifice* in contriving, and *Deceit* in the managing the one as the other. And although the Cardinal Palavicino uses all his Art, to bring this Similitude off, without reflecting on the Honour of the Council; yet that Bishop, who in that Sermon pleaded so much, *That the Spirit of God would open the Mouths of the Council, as he did once those of Balaam and Caiaphas*, was himself in this Expression an illustrious Instance of the truth of what he said. For he spake as true in this, as if he had been *High-Priest himself that Year*. But, as if you really believed your self the truth of that Bishop's Doctrine, *That whatever Spirit was within them, yet being met in Council, the Spirit of God would infallibly inspire them*, you set your self to a serious Vindication of the Proceedings of that Council; and not only so, but triumph in it, as that

that which will bring *the Cause to a speedy Issue*. And therefore we must particularly enquire into all the Pretences you bring to justify the lawfulness and freedom of that *Council*: but, to keep to the *Bishop's Metaphor*,

*Accipe nunc Danaum Insidias ; & crimine ab uno
Disce omnes.*

And when we have thorowly searched this great *Engine* of your Church, we shall have little reason to believe, *that ever it fell from Heaven*. His Lordship then having spoken of the *Usefulness* of free General Councils, for making some Laws which concern the whole Church ; His Adversary thinks presently to give him a *Choak-Pear*, by telling him, *That the Council of Trent was a General Council ; and that had already judged the Protestants to hold Errors*. This you call, *The Laying the Axe to the Root of the Tree* ; that *Tree*, you mean, out of which the Pope's *Infallible Chair* was cut : for the Management of this dispute about the *Council of Trent*, will redound very little to the honour of your Church or Cause. But you do well to add, *That his Lordship was not taken unprovided* : for he truly answered, *That the Council of Trent was neither a Legal, nor a General Council*. Both these we undertake to make good, in Opposition to what you bring by way of Answer to his Lordship's Exceptions to them.

That which we begin with, is, That it was not a *Legal Council*, which his Lordship proves: First, *Because that Council maintained publicly, that it is lawful for them to conclude any Controversie, and make it to be de Fide, and so in your Judgment Fundamental, though it have not a written Word for its warrant ; nay, so much as a probable Testimony from Scripture*. The force of his Lordship's Argument I suppose lies in this, that the Decrees of that *Council* cannot be such as should bind us to an assent to them ; because according to their own Principles, those Decrees may have no Foundation in *Scripture* : And that the only legal proceeding in *General Councils*, is, to decree according to the *Scriptures*. Now to this you answer, *That the meaning of the Council, or Catholick Authors, is not, that the Council may make whatever they please matter of Faith, but only that which is expressed or involved in the Word of God written or unwritten ; and this you confess, is defined by the Council of Trent, in these terms, that in matters of Faith we are to rely not only upon Scripture, but also on Tradition : which Doctrine* (you say) *is true, and that you have already proved it* : And I may as well say, It is false, for I have already answered all your pretended Proofs. But it is one thing, Whether the *Doctrine* be true or no ; and another, Whether the *Council* did proceed legally in defining things upon this Principle. For upon your Grounds you are bound to believe it true, because the *Council* hath defined it to be so : But if you will undertake to justify the Proceedings of the *Council* as legal, you must make it appear that this was the Rule which *General Councils* have always acted by, in defining any thing to be matter of Faith. But if this appear to be false ; and that you cannot instance in any true *General Council*, which did look on this as a sufficient ground to proceed upon, then though the thing may, since that Decree, be believed as true, yet that *Council* did not proceed legally in defining upon such Grounds. Name us therefore, what *Council* did ever offer to determine a matter of Faith meerly upon *Tradition* ? In the four first *General Councils* it is well known, what Authority was given to the *Scripture* in their Definitions : and I hope you will not say, That any thing they defined, had no other ground but *Tradition*. But suppose you could prove this, it is not enough for your purpose, unless you can make it appear, that

N n n

those

P. 219.

P. 213.

¶ 2.

P. 230.

Cusanus de
Concord. Cath.
l. 2. c. 6.

those *Fathers* in making such Decrees, did acknowledge they had no ground in *Scripture* for them. For if you should prove that *really* there was no Foundation but *Tradition*, yet all that you can infer thence, is, That those *Fathers* were deceived in judging they had other Grounds, when they had not. But still, if they made *Scripture* their *Rule*, and looked on nothing else as a *Foundation* for their Definitions, but the *written Word of God*, then the *Council of Trent* did not proceed *legally*, in offering to define matters of *Faith*, on such Grounds which were not acknowledged by the *Primitive Church*, to be sufficient Foundation for such Definitions. *Cardinal Cusanus* at large gives an account of the Method of Proceeding in the *Ancient General Councils*, and therein tells us, not only that the *Word of God* was placed in the middle among those who sate in Council, but gives this as the only Rule of their Proceeding, *quod secundum testimonia Scripturarum decrevit Synodus*; that they decreed according to the Testimonies of *Scripture*. Now if another *Council* shall go according to a different *Rule* from what the *Church* hath esteemed the only true and adequate Foundation for Definition of *Faith*, that *Council* breaks the inviolable *Laws of Councils*, and therefore its Proceedings cannot be *legal*. As for Instance; Supposing a *Parliament* not to have Power to make new *Laws*, but to declare only what is *Law*, and what not (for that is all you pretend to, as to *General Councils*) and that all other former *Parliaments* have all along professed this to be their Rule, *viz. that they search into the Body of the Laws*; and if any thing be controverted, Whether it be a *Law* or no, they make a diligent search into it, and examine all Circumstances concerning it, for their own Satisfaction, and according to the Evidence they find of its being contained in this Body of *Laws*, they declare themselves: but many things growing much in use among a prevailing Party, which have no Colour of being in the *written Laws*, but yet tend much to the Interest of that Party; and these being opposed by such, who stand up for the ancient and known *Laws*, the other are forced to make use of as good an Expedient as they can, to preserve their Interest and Credit together. To which end they pack together a Company of such, who are most concerned to maintain the things in *Question*, and among these, the great *Innovator* sits as *President* among them, and suffers none to come there, but such as are obliged by *Oath* to speak nothing against his *Interest*; and these, when met together, seeing how unable they are to manage their Business according to former *Precedents*; the first thing they do, is to declare, *That Customs and usages have as much the force of Laws among them, as any contained in the Body of them*; and having established this their *Rule*, according to it they decree all the matters in difference, to be true and real *Laws*. Would any Man say, That these Men proceeded *legally*, who first make the *Foundation* they are to go on, contrary to all former *Precedents*, and then define according to that? Yet this, in all Particulars, is exactly the case of the *Council of Trent*; but the last part is that we are now about; that they should, contrary to the Proceedings of all *General Councils* in matters of *Faith*, first make their *Rule*, and then bind all Men to all those *Decrees* which are made according to it. And therefore, though the *Council of Trent* may be thought to act *wisely* in advancing *Traditions* to an equality with *Scripture* in the first place, yet he must have a great deal of Confidence, and little Judgment, who says, that in decreeing Matters of Faith from *Tradition*, is acted *legally*; *i. e.* according to the Rules of the undoubted *General Councils*. I cannot therefore say, whether you have more of the one, or less of the other, when you tell us without offering to prove

prove it, *That the Council did not proceed in a different manner, from other lawful General Councils, whilst she grounded her Definitions, partly on Scripture, partly on Tradition, even in Matters not deducible by any particular or logical Inference from Scripture.* The Absurdity of which Doctrine in itself, I have at large discovered already in our Discourse of the Resolution of Faith, where it is shewed in what Sense his Lordship says, *That Apostolical Tradition is the Word of God*; But that this was a legal Way of proceeding in the Council of Trent, to define Matters of Faith by such Traditions as have no Ground in Scripture, had need be better proved, than by your bare Affirmation. And if that be a Tradition too, I am sure it is one that is neither contained in, nor deducible from, the Scripture.

2. His Lordship justly excepts against the Council of Trent, from the Pope's sitting as President in it. For, saith he, *Is that Council legal, where the Pope the chief Person to be reformed shall sit President in it, and be chief Judge in his own cause against all Law, Divine, Natural, and Humane?* To this you return an Answer, both to the matter of Right, and the matter of Fact. To the matter of Right, you say, *That the Pope not being justly accountable of any Crime, but such as must involve, not only the Council; but the whole Church as well as himself, the Protestants had no just cause to quarrel with the Pope's presiding in it.* Nay, that it is conformable to all Law, Divine, Natural, and Humane, that the Head should preside over the Members; and to give Novellists Liberty to decline the Pope's Judgment, or the Judgment of any other their lawful Superiors upon pretence of their being Parties, is in effect to exempt absolutely such People from all legal Censure; and to grant there is no sufficient means effectually to govern the Church, or condemn Heresie, Schism, and other Offences against Religion. But is it not unanswerable on the other side, that this Plea of yours makes it impossible, that the Errors and Corruptions of a Church should be reformed, in case the Governors of the Church do abett and maintain them? If you say, *That it is not possible the Governors of the Church should do so*, we have nothing but your bare Word for it, and Reason and Experience manifest the contrary. In case then there be a vehement Presumption at least, in a considerable Party of the Church, that the Church is much degenerated and needs Reformation, but those who call themselves the lawful Superiors of the Church utterly oppose it; What is to be done in this case? Must the Church continue as it did, meerly because the Superiors make themselves Parties? Nay, suppose that which you would call Idolatry be in the Church, and the Pope and a Council of his packing declare for it; must there be no Endeavours of a Reformation, but by them who pronounce all Hereticks who oppose them? But you say, *The Head must preside over the Members*: an excellent Argument to defend all Usurpations both in Church and State! for doubtless, they who are in Power will call themselves the Heads of all others, if that will secure them from any Danger. But this will exempt them from all legal Censure: so will your Principles, all Governors of the Church though guilty of Heresie, Blasphemy, Idolatry, or what Crime soever. For still, I hope, the Head must be over the Members; and you say, *it will bring the Church to Confusion, if any shall except against their Superiors as Parties.* You must therefore absolutely and roundly assert, that it is impossible that the Superiors in the Church may be guilty of any Error or Corruption; or that, if they be, they must never be called to an account for it; or else that it may be just in some Cases to except against them as Parties. And if in some Cases, then the Question comes to this, whether they present be some of those Cases or no? And here if you make those Superiors Judges again, what you grant-

ed before comes to nothing. This will be more clear by a Parallel case: Suppose the setting up the *Calves* at *Dan* and *Bethel* had been done without such an open Separation as that of *Jeroboam* was, but that the People had sensibly declined from the Worship of *God* at *Hierusalem*, and had agreed to assemble at those Places, the *High-Priest*, and the *Priests* and *Levites* having deserted *Hierusalem*, and approving this alteration of *God's* Worship: But although this might continue for many Years; yet some of the *inferior Priests* and others of the People reading the *Book of the Law*, they find the Worship of *God* much altered from what it ought to be, which they publish and declare to others, and bring many of the People to be of their *Mind*; but the *High-Priest* and his *Clergy* (foreseeing how much it will be to their Prejudice to bring Things into their due Order) they resolutely oppose it. I pray tell me now, what were to be done in this case? Must the People stand wholly to the Judgment of those *Superior Priests*, who have declared themselves to be utterly averse from any *Reformation*? And if a *Council* be called, is it reasonable or just, that he should sit as *President* in it, because he pretends to be the *Head over the Members*? and that if *Superiors* be once accused as *Parties*, all Order and Peace is gone? Is there any way left or no, whereby the *Church of Israel* might be reformed? *Yes*, say you, by a *General Council*; but, Must it be such a *General Council*, wherein the *High-Priest* sits as *President*, and all who sit with him sworn to do nothing against him? Is this a *Free and General Council* likely to reform these things? And is it not all the *Justice* in the World, that such a *Council* should be truly *Free and General*, and those freely heard who complain of these as great *Corruptions*? and that before the most equal and indifferent *Judges*; or, in case such cannot be assembled, that by the *Assistance* of the *civil Power*, the *Church* may be reformed by its *Parts*: so that still these *Parts* be willing to give an account of what they do before any *Free and General Council*, where the main *Party* accused sits not as *President* in it? But what then, may you say? will you allow all *Inferiors* to proceed to a *Reformation*, in case the *Superiours* do not presently consent? No: but Men ought first to exhibit their *Complaints* of *Abuses*, and the *Reasons* against them, to those who are actually the *Superiors* of the *Church*; and that with all due *Reverence* to *Authority*; but if, notwithstanding this, they declare themselves wilful and obstinate in defence of those Things, by the *Concurrence* of the *Supreme Power* they may lawfully and justly proceed to a *Reformation*.

¶ 4.
P. 231.

Well (but you say) all this comes not to your case, for the *Pope* was not justly accusable of any *Crime*; for you deny not, but that other *Bishops* in *Council* may proceed against the *Pope* himself, if the case do necessarily require it, as if he be a *Heretick*. If you will then grant, that in some Cases, as in that of *Herefie*, the *Pope* may be excepted against as a *Party*, you destroy all that ever you say besides. For when the *Pope* is accused for *Herefie* in a *Council*, who must sit as *President* in that *Council*? The *Pope* himself, or not? If the *Pope* must sit as *President*, (for the *Head*, you say still, must be over the *Members*) Do you think he will ever be condemned for *Herefie*, if he hath the *supream Management* of the *Council*? If he may not sit as *President*, then, by the same Reason he ought not to do it, when he is accused of *Error* or *Usurpation*; but the other *Bishops* of the *Church*, met together by the *Assistance* of *Christian Princes* in a *Free and General Council*, ought to be *Judges* in that case, as well as the former. And this is no more than is agreeable to the *Doctrine* and *Practice* of the *Councils* of *Constance* and *Basil*; for if they had suffered the *Popes* to have been *Presidents* in them,

or

or have had that *Power* over them, which the *Pope's* had in the *Council of Trent*. Do you think they could have done so to the present *Pope's* as they did? But the *Popes* were grown wiser afterwards; they had these Examples fresh in their Memory, and therefore they were resolved never to be ridden by *General Councils* more. And thence came that continual Opposition to all Proposals of the *Emperor* for a *General Council*, till Necessity put the *Pope* upon yielding to it: Thence came the Resolution at *Rome*, not to venture any more *Councils* in *Germany*, for that Place breathed too much Freedom for the *Pope's* Interest, though this were most vehemently desired by both the *Emperor*, and *German Princes* and *Bishops*: Thence, when a *Council* must be called, he summons it first at *Mantua*, then at *Vicenza*, and when none would come thither, at last he yields it should be at *Trent*, a most inconvenient Place for the *Germans* to come to: When they were there, though all Art possible was used to prevent the mention of any thing of *Reformation*, yet sometimes some free Words breaking out, troubled the *Legats*, who dispatch Notice of it to *Rome*, and receive Instructions what to do; yet all could not prevent their Fears and Jealousies, lest something concerning the *Pope's* Interest should be discussed; upon which to make all sure they translate the *Council* to *Bononia*, and leave the *Emperor's* Bishops to blow their Fingers at *Trent*. And when upon the *Emperor* and *King of France's* Protestations, the *Pope* saw a Necessity of removing it back to *Trent* again, though any fair Pretence would have been taken to have dissolved the *Council*; yet since that could not be, the greatest Care must be used to spin out the time, in hopes of some Occurrence happening, which might give a plausible Pretext for breaking it up. But to be sure nothing must pass, but what was privately dispatched to *Rome* and approved there first, (a good sure way to prevent any Mischief) and thence the *Holy-Ghost* came in a *Portmanteau* once or twice a Week, as the common by-word was then. But when, notwithstanding all this, the grand Points of the Residence and Power of *Bishops* were so hotly debated by the *Spanish Bishops*, What Arts were used to divert them! When that would not do, How they bait them in *Council* by the flouting *Italians*! What private Cabals were kept by the *Legats*, what dispatching and posting to *Rome*, what Numbers of jolly *Italians* are made *Bishops*, and sent away to over-vote them? And when the *French-Bishops* were come, what Spies did they keep upon them, what Bones were thrown to divide the *French* and *Spanish Bishops*, what caressing the *Cardinal of Lorrain* to bring him off by the Court of *Rome*? And when any others durst speak freely, What Checks and Frowns, and Disgraces did they meet with? And all this to keep the *Pope* safe, who was still in bodily Fear till the *Council* was ended to his mind; and then what Rejoycing, that they had cheated the World so, that that which was intended to clip the Wings of the Court of *Rome*, had confirmed and advanced the Interest of it. This was truly the *Head's* presiding over the Members: For all the Life and Motion they had, proceeded from the Influence of their Head, the *Pope*: Call you this *Presiding in a Council*? It is rather riding of it, that by the spurring some and bridling others, they may go just as the *Pope* would have them. And that this is a true Account of it, appears, notwithstanding whatever your *Cardinal Palavicino* hath been able to object against the impartial History of it; whose two Volumes pretended in Answer to it, consist of so many Imper-

Caesar Aquilinus de tribus historicis Concilii Trident.

tinencies, and hath so very little material in it, that a *Roman Catholick* himself hath declared to the World, that he hath done more Disservice to the Church of *Rome* by his Answer, than ever Father *Paul* did by his History: p. 49, 51.

By

By whom, his two great Books are compared to those *Night-Birds* that make a great shew, but are all Feathers and very little Flesh. This then being the way of management of Things at *Trent*, judge you or any reasonable Man, Whether the *Protestants* have not just Cause to except against the *Presidentship* which the *Pope* had in that *Council*; and name you any *General Council* (that was truly accounted so) where-ever he had any thing like it? The Particulars you mention, will be considered afterwards.

ð. 5.
Ibid.

But you say, *All this was because the Pope was not justly accusable of any Crime, but what must involve not only the Council, but the whole Church as much as himself.* If so, there was the greater Reason that he should leave it to the Church in a *Free Council* to have impartially debated Things, without his acting and interposing so much as he did. But the *Pope* was wiser than to think so; he knew there were many Things in the Court of *Rome* which many other *Bishops* struck at, as well as the *Protestants*; and that they desired a *Reformation* of *Abuses* as well as the other, especially the *German, French, and Spanish Bishops*. Nay, it is strange to see how much Interest or Prejudice blinds Men, that they will not acknowledge now that there was any such need of *Reformation*, when *Pope Adrian VI.* confessed at the *Diet* at *Norimberg*, *A. D. 1522.* by *Cheregatus* his *Legat*, that the *Popes* themselves had been the Fountain and Cause of all those Evils in the Church: In these remarkable Words (part of which have been cited already on another Occasion) *Scimus in hac sancta Sede, aliquot jam annis, multa abominanda fuisse, abusus in Spiritualibus, excessus in mandatis, & omnia deniq; in perversum mutata. Nec mirum, si ægritudo à capite in membra, à summis Pontificibus in alios Prælatos descenderit. Omnes nos (sc. Prælati Ecclesiastici) declinavimus, unusquisq; in vias suas, nec fuit jamdiu, qui faceret bonum, non fuit usq; ad unum. Quamobrem necesse est, ut omnes demus gloriam Deo, & humiliemus animas nostras ei: videat unusquisq; nostrum unde exciderit, & se potius quilibet judicet, quàm à Deo in virga furoris sui judicari velit. Qua in re quod ad nos pertinet, pollicebris, Nos omnem operam adhibitueros, ut primum Cueria hac, unde forte omne hoc malum processit reformetur: ut sicut inde corruptio in omnes inferiores emanavit, ita ab eadem sanitas & reformatio omnium emanet. Ad quod procurandum nos tanto arctius obligatos reputamus, quando universum mundum hujusmodi reformationem avidius desiderare videmus.* Can you now for shame say, *There was no need of Reformation at that time, and that the Popes were no more concerned than the whole Church?* The whole Church was indeed concerned, to see the Court of *Rome* reformed, and we see the *Pope* confesseth, that all the World desired a *Reformation*. Doth not he ingenuously acknowledge, *That many abominable things had been for many Years in the Holy See* (and very holy it was, the mean time) *that all things were out of Order. That the Distemper had fallen from the Head to the Members, from the Popes to other Prelates, that they had all gone out of the way, that for a long time there had been none that did good, no not one. That therefore it was necessary, that all should give Glory to God, and humble their Souls; and every one see whence he was fallen, and judge himself, rather than be judged by God in the Rod of his Fury. Wherefore* (saith he to his *Legat*) *thou shalt promise for us, that we will use our utmost Endeavour, that this Court, from whence all the Mischief hath proceeded, may be reformed; that as the Corruption hath flowed from thence unto Inferiors, so the Health and Reformation of all may come from thence too. And we look on our selves as the more obliged to procure this, because we see the whole World doth earnestly desire such a Reformation.* Whom must we now believe

lieve, the *Pope* or you? the *Pope* ingenuously and *Christianly* bemoaning the *Corruptions* that had been in *Popes* themselves, and from them had spread to others; or you, who basely and untruly flatter the *Popes*, as though they needed no Reformation, but what concerned the *Council* and *Church*, as well as them? And the *Pope* gives you the true reason of it, *Because the Corruptions had been so great at Rome, that from thence they had spread over all others.* And can you think now, that the *Pope* was not justly accused of any Crime, but that he might sit as *President*, and manage the Affairs of the *Council*, as though there had been no need at all of any *Reformation*? But I remember an Observation of *Baronius*, that the Providence of God was so great in watching over the *Roman See*, that the *Popes* who were unfit to Govern it, seldom continued long in it; which he makes upon *Siricius* his favour to *Rufinus*; and such a *Pope* was this *Adrian* accounted; this Confession of his being very distastful at *Rome*, he continued not long after it. But yet I know you have another Answer ready at hand, *That all this concerned only some Abuses in Manners and Management of Affairs, but nothing confessed to be amiss in Doctrine of Faith.* However, since it belonged to the *Council* to reform those Abuses, the *Pope* as an interested Person ought not to have *presided* there, had it not been his Intention to have prevented any real *Reformation*. For all the Decrees of the *Council* to that Purpose were merely delusory and nothing of *Reformation* followed upon them; and the most important things to that end could never pass the *Council*. And if we gain this, that the *Pope* ought not to be *Judge*, where himself is concerned, as to the *Reformation of Abuses*; your former Assertion will make the other follow, *viz.* that in Case of *Heresie*, other *Bishops* may in *Council* proceed against the *Pope*, and, by the same Reason, when any *Errors* in Faith are charged upon him, or those who joyn in Communion with him; that such ought to be debated in a full and free *Council*, where no one concerned may *preside* to *over-awe* the rest. But such *Presidents* should be appointed as were in former *general Councils*, to whom it belonged to manage the Debates of the *Council*, without any such Power and Jurisdiction over them, as the *Pope* pretended to have, over all those assembled at *Trent*. And thus it appears, that what his Lordship said, was just and true, *That it is contrary to all Law, Divine, Natural and Humane, that the Pope should be chief Judge in his own Cause.* Your Instances of *Pope Leo* at the *Council of Chalcedon*, and *Alexander* at the *Council of Nice*, will be considered in their due Place.

Which that we may come to, we must examine the *matter of Fact*, as to the *Pope's Presidency in general Councils*. His Lordship denying, *that the Pope did preside in the Council of Nice, either by himself or Legates, because Hosius was the President of it*; You Answer, *That Hosius did preside in that Council, and so did likewise Vitus and Vincentius Priests of Rome, but (you say) they all presided as the Pope's Legates and not otherwise. This (you say) appears by their subscribing the Conciliary Decrees in the first place, of which no other Account can be given; and because Cedrenus and Photius confess that the Pope gave Authority to this Council by his Legates; and in the old Preface to the Council of Sardica, it is said expressly, that Hosius was the Pope's Legate, and the same acknowledged by Hincmarus, and Gelasius Cyzicenus, whom you prove that Photius had read.* These being then all the Evidences you produce for the *Pope's Presidency at the Nicene Council*, we are obliged to afford them a particular Consideration.

Your first Argument, which *Bellarmino* and *Baronius* likewise insist on, is the Order of Subscription, *because the name of Hosius is set first*; but, if we mark

p. 6.

Ibid:

mark it, this Argument supposeth that which it should prove. For thus it proceeds, *Hosius* subscribed first, and therefore he was the *Roman Legate*; *Hosius* was the *Roman Legate*, and therefore he subscribed first: For it supposeth that the first Subscription did of right belong only to the *Roman Legate*; which we may as well deny, by an Argument just like it, *Vitus* and *Vincentius* did not subscribe first, and therefore the *Roman Legates* did not subscribe first. But you ask, *Why then did Hosius subscribe before the Patriarchs, and other Bishops, of greater Dignity than himself?* I answer, *Because Hosius was President of the Council, and not they.* But if you ask, *Why they chose him President before others,* the *Nicene Fathers* must answer you, and not I. But you say, *Cedrenus* and *Photius* confess, *That the Pope gave Authority to the Nicene Council by his Legates*; but, How comes that to prove, that *Hosius* was one of those Legates? *Photius* I am sure in his Book of the *Seven Synods* (first published in Greek by *Justellus* out of the *Sedan Library*) says no such thing, but only mentions the two *Presbyters* who were there the *Roman Bishop's Legates*. And *Cedrenus* only mentions the *Roman Legates* amongst those who were chief in that Council, reckoning up the several *Patriarchs*. Your old Preface to the *Sardican Synod* (supposed of *Dionysius Exiguus*) is no competent Testimony, being of a later Author, and a *Roman* too: And *Hincmarus* is much younger than he, and therefore neither of their Testimonies hath any force against the ancient Writers; neither hath that of *Gelasius Cyzicenus*, who lived under *Basilius*, A. D. 476. And that you may not think I do you wrong, to deprive you of his Testimony, you may see, How freely *Baronius* passeth his Censure upon those *Acts* under the Name of *Nicene Council*. *Sed, ut liberè dicam, somnia puto hæc omnia*; that I may speak freely, I account them no better than Dreams: And gives this very good Reason for it; because ever since the time of that Council, all Persons have been so extremely desirous of the *Acts* of that Council, and yet could never obtain them. But that which comes in the rear, transcends all the rest, which is, *That Photius, though a Schismatical Greek, and bitter Enemy of the Roman Church, witnesseth he had read this Book of Gelasius, and in it the above-cited Testimony.* And, I pray, What follows from thence? I hope *Photius* had read many other Books in that excellent Collection of his *Bibliotheca* besides this; and, Will you say, that *Photius* believed all that he there saith he had read? No, but you say, *That thereupon he confesses that the said Hosius was Legate for the Bishop of Rome, at the Council of Nice.* But you would have done well to have told us, Where this Confession is extant: for you seem to insinuate, as though it were in the same place where he mentions the reading this Book of *Gelasius*: but he only saith, *That Gelasius affirms it*, adding nothing at all of his own Judgment; and in his Book of the *Seven Synods*, where he declares his own Mind, he only mentions *Vitus* and *Vincentius*, as the *Legates* of the *Roman See*: And brings in *Hosius* afterwards, not joining him with *Vitus* and *Vincentius*, but with *Alexander* of *Constantinople*, and *Sylvester* and *Julius* of *Rome*, and *Alexander* and *Athanasius* of *Alexandria*, whom he makes the Chief in the Council. For if *Photius* had intended to have made *Hosius* one of the Pope's Legates; there was all the Reason in the World he should have set him before *Vitus* and *Vincentius*, who were only *Presbyters*. And that the Pope had no other Legates there but these two *Presbyters*, we have the consent of all the ancient Ecclesiastical Historians; *Eusebius* mentioning the absence of the *Roman Bishop*, because of his Age adds, *πρεσβύτεροι δ' αὐτῷ παρόντες τὴν αὐτῷ τάξιν ἐπώνυμον*, His *Presbyters* being present, supplied his place; so *Theodoret* the Bishop of *Rome* could not be

Baron. A. D.
305. *sect. 6.*

Photius in Bib-
lioth. Cod. 88.
p. 21.

Phot. de 7. Sy-
nod. &c. p. 163.

Euseb. de vita
Constan. l. 3. c.
7. Theod. hist.
Eccles. l. 1. c.
6.

be present *ὅς μὲντοι πρεσβύτερος ἀπέειπε*, but he sent two Presbyters with Power to give his Assent; not to preside over the Council. To the same Purpose Sozomen, Nicephorus, Zonaras speak. And it is very strange not one of all these Historians should mention this, if Hosius had presided there as Legate of the Bishop of Rome; and much more, that Hosius should not subscribe first in that Capacity, but only as Bishop of Corduba; for the Pope's Legates do not use to be so forgetful of their Place and Honour. It seems then very plain, that the Pope had no manner of Presidency at the Council of Nice? We come therefore to following Councils.

You grant, That in the second General Council, Nestarius Bishop of Constantinople was President, and not the Pope or his Legates! But the Reason (you say) was, because Pope Damasus having first summoned that Council to be held at Constantinople, and the Bishops of the Oriental Provinces being accordingly there met, the Pope, for some Reasons, altered his mind, and would have had them come to Rome, to joyn with the Bishops he had there assembled; which the Prelates at Constantinople refusing in a submissive manner, alledged such Arguments as the Pope remained satisfied with them. So the Council (you say) was upon the Matter held in two Places, at Rome, and Constantinople. So that while the Pope presided in the Council at Rome, and gave Allowance to their Proceedings at Constantinople, and that by reason of their Entercourse, they were looked on but as one Council in Effect, and the Pope to have presided therein. In all this you discover, How much you take up things upon trust, and utter them with great Confidence, when they seem for your Purpose, although they are built upon notorious mistakes in Ecclesiastical History; as I shall make it plain to you this Answer of yours is. For neither was the General Council at Constantinople ever in the least summoned by the Pope, neither did it sit at the same time that the Council at Rome under Damasus did; neither were any Letters sent from that Council to the Pope; and therefore certainly Pope Damasus could not in any sense be said to preside there. These things, I know, make you wonder at first; but I shall undertake to make it appear, How much your great Masters (I need not name them to you) have abused your Credulity in this Story. We are to know then, that the Emperor Theodosius having been newly admitted into a share of the Empire by Gratian, and the Eastern Parts of it being allotted to him, he considering what a deplorable Condition the Churches of those Parts were in, by reason of the Factions and Heresies which were among them, judges it the best expedient to call a Council at Constantinople; to see if there were any hopes to bring the Church to any Peace. For this purpose 150 Bishops meet from the several Provinces at Constantinople, who condemn Macedonius, publish a new Creed, make several Canons, accept of Gregory Nazianzen's Resignation of the See of Constantinople, chuse Nestarius in his room, and on the Death of Meletius at Antioch, elect Flavianus to succeed him, make a Synodical Epistle to the Emperor Theodosius, giving him an Account of their Proceedings, and so dissolve. This is the short of the Narration of it in Theodoret, Socrates, and Sozomen. But as soon as the Report of their Actions was come into the Western Party, great Discontents are taken at their Proceedings, especially at the Election of Flavianus to the See at Antioch; because the Church of Rome had declared it self in favour of Paulinus at Antioch, during the Life of Meletius, and therefore by no Means would they now yield to the Succession of Flavianus. Upon this, Damasus sollicit the Emperor Gratian for a General Council, that the Cause might be heard; and, that the

O o o

Eastern

Sozom. l. 1.
c. 16.
Nicephor. l. 8.
c. 14.

δ. 7.
P. 232.

Theodoret. Ec-
cles. hist. l. 5.
c. 8, 9.
Socrat. l. 5.
cap. 8;
Sozomen. l. 7.
c. 12.

Eastern Bishops might meet too, he sends other Letters to *Theodosius* to the same Purpose; upon the Intimation of which, the *Eastern Bishops*, who either were detained at *Constantinople* by several Occurrences there, or were sent again out of their *Provinces* thither, assemble together, and write a *Synodical Epistle* to *Damasus*, *Ambrosius*, *Britton*, *Valerian*, &c. wherein they give an Account, Why they could not come to *Rome*, because the *Eastern Churches* could not, in so divided and busie a time, be left destitute of their *Bishops*, and therefore they desire to be excused; but however, they had sent *Cyriacus*, *Eusebius*, and *Priscianus*, as their *Legates* thither. This Excuse the *Emperor Theodosius* accepted of, and *Damasus* and his Council were fain to rest satisfied with it; only some of *Paulinus* his Party met him there, as *Epiphanius* and *S. Hierom* (although *S. Hierom* being no Bishop, could only shew his good Will, and take that Opportunity of returning to *Rome*). What this Council did under *Damasus*, we are to seek; for both *Baronius* and *Binius* confess, that the *Acts* of that Council, are wholly lost; only *Baronius* thinks, the Condemnation of *Apolinaris* and *Timotheus* (which *Theodoret* mentions) to have been done before; and that *Paulinus* was restored to the *See* of *Antioch* by this Council: which seems the more probable, in that *Paulinus* the next Year returns to *Antioch*; and because the *Bishops* of *Rome* afterwards took his Part, and defended his Successour against *Flavianus* in the *See* of *Antioch*. This being the true Account of those Proceedings, let now any indifferent Person judge, Whether you were not much put to it, when you are fain to confound two Councils held at several times on several Occasions, on Purpose to blind the Reader, and to make him believe that *Pope Damasus* had somewhat to do, in calling and presiding in the General Council at *Constantinople*; because he requested the Meeting of the *Bishops* again the Year after the General Council. And the Truth of this, is so plain, that *Baronius* and *Binius* confess the Difference of these two Councils, both as to the Times and occasions of them. *Baronius* placeth the *Oecumenical Council* at *Constantinople*, *A. D.* 381. *Eucherius* and *Syagrius* being COSS. in May: But the other Council at *Constantinople*, he placeth the year after, *A. D.* 382. *Syagrius* and *Antonius* COSS. at which time likewise the Council at *Rome* sate. And so *Binius* reckons this Council as a second Council at *Constantinople* under *Damasus*, and, in all things concerning the times of this and the former, follows *Baronius* exactly. So much are the two great Cardinals, *Bellarmino* and *Perron* mistaken, when they would have the Council at *Constantinople* called *Oecumenical* on this Account, because there was a Council at *Rome* sitting under *Damasus*, at the same time, approving what was done at *Constantinople*. Whereas the Occasion of the Council at *Rome* was given by some of the last Acts of the *Oecumenical Council*, viz. the Election of *Flavianus*. But that this could not be, that those two Councils at *Rome* and *Constantinople*, should sit together at the same time, and on the same Account, appears by the *Synodical Epistle* of the Council the Year following sent to *Damasus*, which is exemplified both in *Binius* and *Baronius*, and is originally Extant in *Theodoret*. Although *Binius* placeth it at the end of the *Oecumenical Council*, but *Baronius* much more fairly in the next Year, as being the Act of the second Council. Now there are two things in that *Synodical Epistle* by which I shall prove it impossible, that either the Letters of *Pope Damasus* did concern the calling of the *Oecumenical Council*, or that the sitting of the Council at *Rome*, and the general one at *Constantinople*, could be at the same time. The first is from the Date of those Letters,

Baron Ann.
382. sect. 17.

Annal. Ann.
381. sect. 17.

A. D. 382.
sect. 45, &c.
Tom. 1. Concil.
p. 686.

Bellarmino de
Concil. l. 1. c. 5

Perron's Reply.
l. 1. cap. 34.

Bin. Tom. 1.
Concil. p. 665.
Theod. hist. Ec-
cles. l. 5. c. 9.

A. D. 382.
sect. 9.

Letters, which is thus expressed there: that they met together at *Constantinople*, having received the Letters which were sent the Year before from them to the *Emperor Theodosius*, *μετὰ τὴν ἐν Ἀκυλεῖᾳ συνόδον*, after the Synod at Aquileia. Now the Synod at Aquileia by *Baronius* his Computation, was ^{Ann. 381.} held the same Year *A. D. 381.* in which the *Oecumenical Council* at *Constantinople* was held, and much later in the Year too, for this was held in ^{scilicet. 80,} the *Nones of September*, and the other in *May*; and so much is likewise ^{Tom. 1. Council p. 682.} confessed by *Binius* in his Notes on that Council. Now let me demand of you, Whether is it impossible that *Damasus* should, by his Letters, summon the *Oecumenical Council*, when the date of those Letters to *Theodosius*, is so long after the sitting of it? But besides this, these *Eastern Bishops* in that Council, which sat after these Letters of *Damasus*, clearly distinguished themselves from the *Oecumenical Council* of the Year foregoing: for, after they had given a brief Account of their Faith, they refer the Pope and *Western Council* to that Declaration of Faith which had been made the Year before by the *Oecumenical Council* assembled at *Constantinople*, *τῇ πύρρῃ ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει παρὰ τῆς ἀναγκρατικῆς ἐκτεθέσθαι συνόδου*. Is it possible then any thing should be more evident, than that this Council assembled upon the Letters of *Damasus* to *Theodosius*, and sitting with the Council at *Rome*, is clearly distinct from the *Oecumenical Council* of *Constantinople*? And thus I hope I have dispelled those Mists which you would cast before the Readers Eyes, by confounding these two Councils, and thereby offering to prove, that the Pope had some kind of very remote Presidency in the second *General Council*. Which is so far from being true, that there is not any Intimation in any of the ancient Historians, *Theodoret*, *Socrates*, or *Sozomen*, that the Pope, or any of the *Western Bishops*, had any thing at all to do in it. But you will ask, *How comes it then to be accounted an Oecumenical Council?* For this indeed *Baronius* would fain find out some hand that *Damasus* had in it, or else he cannot conceive how it should become *Oecumenical*; but all the Proof he produceth, is, *Because in the Acts of the sixth Council it is said, that Theodosius and Damasus opposed Macedonius*: and so I hope he might do by declaring his consent to the Doctrine decreed in this Council; not that thereby his Approbation made it *Oecumenical*. And, as that Doctrine was received, and that Confession of Faith embraced all over the World, so that Council became *Oecumenical*. For I cannot see but that if *Damasus* had stood up for *Macedonius*, if the Decrees against him had been received by the *Catholic Church*, it had been never the less *Oecumenical* in the Sense of Antiquity: That Testimony which *Baronius* brings out of his own Library, and a Copy of the *Vatican*, expressing that *Damasus* did summon the Council at *Constantinople*, is not to be taken against the consent of the ancient *Church-Historians*; it being well known what Interest those *Roman Copies* have a long time driven on. I deny not therefore but that the Council of *Constantinople* was assented to by *Damasus*, and the *Western Bishops*, in the Matters of Faith there decided, but I utterly deny that *Damasus* had any thing to do in the Presidency over that Council. So that we find a Council always acknowledged to be *Oecumenical*, in which the Pope had no Presidency at all; and this very Instance sufficiently refutes your Hypothesis, viz. *That the Pope's Presidency is necessary to a General Council.*

In the third *General Council* held at *Ephesus*, *A. D. 431.* it is agreed on both sides, that *S. Cyril*, Patriarch of *Alexandria*, was the President of it: §. 8. but the Question is, In what Capacity he sat there, whether in his own,

P. 232.

Ann. 430.
Sect. 23. 25.

or as *Legate* of *Celestine Bishop* of *Rome*? All the Proof you produce for the latter, is, *That it appears by a Letter written to him by the Pope, long before he sent any other Legates to that Council; in which Letter he gives S. Cyril charge to supply his Place, as is testified by Evagrius, Prosper, Photius, and divers other Authors.* But here again you offer to confound two things, which are of a distinct Nature; for you would have your Reader believe, that this *Letter* was sent by *Cælestine* to *Cyril*, in order to his *Presidentship* in the *Council*, whereas this *Letter* was sent the Year before, without any relation to the *Council*; as appears by the Series of the Story; which is briefly this: The Differences in the *Eastern Churches* increasing about the Opinions broached by *Nestorius*, *S. Cyril* of *Alexandria* chiefly appearing in Opposition to them, they both write (much about the same time) to *Pope Cælestine*, impeaching each other of *Herefie*. But before *Cælestine* had read the Letters from *Nestorius* in Vindication of himself, *Possidonius* a *Deacon* of *Alexandria* comes with several Dispatches from *S. Cyril*, wherein a large Account is given of the *Herefie* and Actions of *Nestorius*; upon which the *Pope* calls a *Council* at *Rome*, and therein examines the Allegations on both sides, which being done, the *Council* condemns *Nestorius*, and passeth this Sentence on him, *That ten days should be allowed him (after notice given) for his Repentance; and, in case of Obstinacy, he should be declared excommunicate.* And for executing this Sentence, *Cælestine* commits his Power to *Cyril*; not as though it belonged to the *Pope* only to do it, but that by this Means there might appear the Consent of the *Western* with the *Eastern Bishops*, in putting *Nestorius* out of the Communion of the *Catholick Church*. *S. Cyril* having received these Letters by the return of *Possidonius*, dated the third of the *Ides* of *August*, as appears by the Letters extant in *Baronius*, calls a *Council* at *Alexandria*, in which four *Legates* are decreed to be sent to *Constantinople* in pursuance of the Sentence against *Nestorius*, they deliver the Letters of *Cælestine* and *Cyril* to him, he returns them no Answer at all, but addresses himself to the *Emperor Theodosius*, and complains of the Persecutions of *Cyril*, which occasioned a very sharp Letter of the *Emperor* to him, charging him with disturbing the *Churches Peace*. But this was not all; for *Cyril* having with the *Synodical Epistle* of the *Council* of *Alexandria*, sent twelve *Anathematisms* to be subscribed by *Nestorius*, he was so far from it, that he charges *Cyril* with the *Herefie* of *Apollinarius* in them, and sends them to *Johannes Antiochenus*, who (with the *Syrian Bishops* of his *Diocese*) joyn with *Nestorius* in the Impeachment of *Cyril*. So that by this means the Sentence against *Nestorius* could not be put in Execution, because of the dissent of the *Eastern Bishops*, and that *S. Cyril* stood charged with *Herefie* as well as the other. Things being grown to this height, *Theodosius* calls a *General Council* at *Ephesus*, to be held the ensuing Year, writes to all the *Metropolitans* to appear there at the time appointed, and bring such *Bishops* with them, as they thought convenient; but what Contentions happened there between the two Parties, is not here our Business to relate; but the *Emperor* foreseeing what Disturbance was like to be there, sent the Count *Candidianus* for better Management of the Affairs of the *Council*. Now *S. Cyril* and his Party having the Advantage of the other, both in Number and Forwardness of being there, *Cyril* sits as *President* among them. The Question now is, Whether he sat there by virtue of that *Legantine Power* he had for the excommunicating *Nestorius* the Year before, or not? or only as *Patriarch* of *Alexandria*, and chief of that Party? But by what Authority he should challenge to be

President

President of the *Council*, because he had been deputed by *Cælestine* to act his part in the excommunicating *Nestorius*, I think is somewhat hard to understand. Neither doth any thing appear in the *Council* which gives any ground for it; for *Cyril* subscribes to it meerly as *Patriarch* of *Alexandria*, the *Council* on all occasions call him, and *Memnon* of *Ephesus* their *president*, and when they speak of *Cælestine*, after his *Legates* came, they say, He did only *assiste* together with them in *Council*: But, Why should *Cælestine* send other *Legates* afterwards, viz. *Arcadius*, *Philippus*, and *Projectus*, if *S. Cyril* supplied the Pope's Place there already? Yet, although we should grant, that before the *Legates* came, *Cyril* did supply the place of *Cælestine*, it doth not follow, that he sate *President* of the *Council* on that Account: but only to shew the Concurrence of *Cælestine* with the *Council* in matter of Doctrine; and this there was good Reason for, because *Cælestine* had fully declared himself to *Cyril* concerning that already. And this was usual in the *Councils*, as appears in this very *Council* by *Flavianus* Bishop of *Philippi*; subscribing likewise in the place of *Rufus* of *Thessalonica*. So that if we grant *Cyril* to sit in the *Council* as *Legate* of *Cælestine*, yet it doth not follow, that he was *President* of the *Council* in that Capacity; for the other was only to testify his Consent, this required a particular Commission to that purpose. So that he might give a *Vote* in the *Council* for *Cælestine*, and yet sit (as he did) *President* of the *Council* as *Patriarch* of *Alexandria*. Thus it being manifested, that in the three first General *Councils*, the Pope sate not either by himself or his *Legates* as *President*, it is sufficiently proved thereby, that his *Presidency* is no necessary Condition to a General *Council*; and if not, then we say, It is unjust and unreasonable he should challenge it, when he is the Person mainly accused. But in the mean while it is not at all necessary, that we should deny that ever he sate as *President* in any other General *Council*, for being the *Bishop* of the chief See, Why should he in a case of general Concernment to the Church, as that of *Chalcedon*, not be allowed by his *Legates* to have the prime Place? But there wants sufficient Evidence too, that these were properly the *Presidents* of that *Council*. In the next at *Constantinople* you grant, that *Eutychius* Bishop of *Constantinople* sate *President*; but you say, That he acknowledged this Privilege to be due to Pope *Vigilius*. But, How came it to pass then, that he would not sit there, though then at *Constantinople*? It appears by the many frivolous *Excuses* he made, that he durst not trust himself in the *Council*, for fear that Authority should not be given him which he expected. For that hath always been the Subtilty of the Popes in those elder Times, when they began to encroach, not to venture themselves in presence in a General *Council*, for fear of Opposition, but by their absence they reserved to themselves a Liberty to declare their dissent, when any Acts passed which did not please them. As *Leo* did in the case of the *Council* of *Chalcedon*. But however, this is evident from the fifth General *Council*, that the Pope's *Presidency* was not then thought at all necessary. What was done in following *Councils*, is not material to our purpose, because it doth already sufficiently appear, that the Pope's *Presidency* is not necessary to a General *Council*, and therefore you conclude with a notorious Falsity, in saying with *Bellarmin*, That the Pope hath been possess full 1500 Years of the right of presiding in General *Councils*.

His Lordship's third Exception against the *Council* of *Trent*, is, That the place was not free, but either in, or too near the Pope's Dominions. To this you Answer, That certainly *Trent* is not within the Pope's Dominion: but it is well enough known, that *Trent* was under the sole Jurisdiction of the Bishop,

§. 9.

Ibid.

Review of the
Council of
Trent, l. i. c. 7.

Bishop, and the *Bishop* to be sure was under the Pope's Dominion, having been particularly obliged too, by receiving a *Cardinal's Hat*. And therefore it was not without just Reason that the *Place* was protested against, not only by the *German Protestants*, as being out of *Germany* where the *States* of the *Empire* had often promised the *Council* should be; at the Diet at *Norimberg* 1524, at *Auspurg* 1526. *Spire* 1529. *Ratisbone* 1532, 1541. again at *Norimberg* 1543. and last of all at *Spire* 1544. but as a most inconvenient *Place* for them to come to; being a *Week's Journey* (as they say) from the Borders of *Germany*, seated in a barren and almost inaccessible *Place*, having no freedom of Passage almost amidst the *Alps*: This place, I say, was not only protested against by them, as being contrary to the Promises made to them; but the *German Bishops* made it their earnest Request, that the *Council* might be held in *Germany*; for at *Trent*, they said they could neither be present themselves, nor send any *Legates* thither: and particularly instance in the unpassableness of the *Alps* between them and *Trent*: and that it was rather in the Borders of *Italy* than *Germany*. And the Pope himself in his Answer to the *German Bishops*, and the *Emperor's Protestation* upon the removal of the *Council* from *Trent* to *Bononia*, insists upon the Inconvenience of *Trent* for the long Residence of the *Bishops* there. And in behalf of the *Protestants* declaring against this *Place* in regard of the unsafeness of it, the *Places* about being all under the Pope's Authority: *du Ranchin* tells you, That it is an Exception allowable by the *Doctors of the Canon-Law*, who all agree, that an Exception against the Safety of the *Place* is pertinent, and ought to be admitted; that it is good, both by the *Civil Law* and the *Law of Nature*, that a *Man* summon'd to a *Place* where any danger threatens him, is not bound to appear, nor to send his *Proctor*, and that a *Judge* is bound to assign the *Parties* a *place of Safety* for the hearing of their Cause, otherwise there is just cause of Appeal. That the *Council of Pisa* excepted against appearing at *Rome* on the same Accounts, and if they durst not venture to *Rome* upon the offer of Safe-conduct, much less reason had the *Protestants* to do it, to such a *Place* as *Trent*, a *City*, by reason of the neighbouring Woods very subject to Treacheries and Ambushments; that the very designing such a *Place* yielded ground of Fear and Suspicion, especially to such as had not forgotten the late Examples of *John Husse*, and *Hierom* of *Prague* at the *Council of Constance*. That the *States* of *Germany* in the Diet at *Francford*, A. D. 1338. pleaded the Nullity of the Pope's Excommunication of *Lewis* 5, because he was cited to *Avignon* where the Pope was Lord of the *Place*; and the place being not free for him to appear at, the summons were not *Canonical*, but void and invalid in Law. This and many other Instances are there brought by the same learned Author, to justify the *Protestants* in not appearing at *Trent*, because the *Place* was not free nor safe; although the Author seems not to have been one himself. All these things being considered, he must have been an *Infidel* indeed, who would pronounce *Trent* to have been the most indifferent place for both *Parties* to meet at. For what you say, That it might have been as unsafe for the Pope and his Party, if it had been in *Germany*: there is no Reason at all for it, because of the *Emperors* openly owning that Interest; but if you plead the Wars of *Germany* which then broke out, I hope that may serve as a further Plea for the *Protestants*, who were in a good Condition to go to a free *Council* about matters of Religion, when a War was already begun upon them upon the account of Religion, as most evidently appears, not only by the Supplies sent by the Pope, but by the Transactions afterwards between the Pope and the *Emperor*, in some of which it is expressly confessed.

But

But supposing the place had been never so free, there is another great Exception remaining still, viz. *That none had Suffrage, but such as were sworn to the Pope and Church of Rome, and professed Enemies to all that call'd for Reformation or a free Council.* To this you Answer, 1. *That it is no new thing for Bishops to take an Oath of Canonical Obedience to the Pope; for St. Gregory mentions it as an ancient Custom in his Time; and therefore this Objection would serve as much against ancient General Councils as this of Trent.* 2. *That the Bishop's Oath doth not deprive them of the liberty of their Suffrage; nay it doth not so much as oblige them not to proceed and vote even against the Pope himself, if they see just cause; but only that they will be obedient to him, so long as he commands things suitable to the will of God and the Sacred Canons of the Church.* But what Falshood and Fraud lies in both these Answers, it will not take up much time to discover. Could you without blushing offer to say, *That no other Oath was taken by the Bishops at the Council of Trent than what was taken in ancient General Councils?* For so much your Words imply, when you say, *That the same Objection would have held as well against them as this of Trent.* Why do you not produce some Instance of an Oath taken to the Pope in any of the first General Councils? I dare challenge you to bring any Footsteps of any such thing in any ancient Council; and you must needs have exceedingly hardened your Forehead that durst let fall any thing tending that way. It was in much later Times before that Oath of Canonical Obedience from Bishops to their Metropolitan came up; and when it did, no more took any such Oath to the Bishop of Rome, than such as were under his Metropolitan Jurisdiction. In your Citation of Gregory, you would let us see how far you can out-go Bellarmine himself in these Things. For Bellarmine only proves, that it is not new for Bishops to take an Oath of Canonical Obedience to the Pope; but you say, *That Gregory mentions it as an ancient Custom in his Time,* which is egregiously false. For there is not one Word in all that Epistle implying any thing of former Custom, neither doth it contain an Oath of Canonical Obedience made by every Bishop at his Consecration, but only a Form of Renunciation of Heresie by any Bishop who comes off from it to the Catholick Church, and so the Title of it is, *Promissio cujusdam Episcopi hæresin suam anathematizantis*; and what is this, I pray, to the Oath taken by every Bishop at his Consecration? Wherein he swears, *to defend and retain the Roman Papacy, and the Royalties of S. Peter* (so their new Pontifical hath it, whereas in the old one it was *regulas Sanctorum Patrum*) *against all Men.* And was this no more than a bare Oath of Canonical Obedience? The first mention we meet with of any Oath of Canonical Obedience taken by Men in Orders, is in the eleventh Council of Toledo, cap. 10. held, saith Loyasa, A. D. 675. and therein indeed they say it is expedible, a matter they judge expedient, *That those in Orders should, Promissionis suæ vota sub cautione spondere, bind themselves by promise to observe the Catholick Faith, and obey their Superiors:* but here is nothing at all concerning any Oath to be taken by all Bishops to the Pope; though Bellarmine produce it to that purpose. For that was much later than the time of this Council, it beginning at the time of the Contests between the Popes and Princes about Investitures; then the Pope to secure as many as he could to himself, binds them in Oath of Fealty and Allegiance, rather than Canonical Obedience to himself; by which, as Spalatenfis truly saith, *he makes the Bishops his Slaves and Vassals.* And therefore in another Place, he justly wonders, that any Christian Princes will suffer any Bishops to make that Homage by this Oath to the Pope, which is only due to themselves. For, saith he, *That Oath which was only of Canonical*

d. 10.

P. 233.

De Concil.

l. 1. c. 22.

Greg. ep.

l. 10. c. 31.

De Repub.

Eccles. Tom. 1.

l. 4. c. 7. sect.

52. Tom. 2. l.

6. c. 7 n. 102.

Protestatio ad-
versus Concil.
Trident. p. 22.
A. D. 1563.

nonical Obedience before, they have turned it into absolute Homage to the Pope, so that none can be consecrated Bishops without it. But yet you would persuade us, that notwithstanding this Oath, they may proceed and vote against the Pope himself. Surely, Pope Pius 2. was of another mind, who (as the Appendix to Urspergensis tells us) in an Epistle to the Chapter at Mentz, saith, *That to speak Truth against the Pope, is to break their Oath.* But all this will more evidently appear, if we produce the Form of the Oath it self, I mean not that in the old Roman Pontifical, but that which was taken in Julius the third's time, which was in the time of the sitting of the Council of Trent. In which, besides in the first place a Promise of Obedience to the Pope and his Successors, and a Promise of Concealment of all his Councils, there are these exprets Words, *Jura, honores, privilegia, & auctoritatem Romanæ Ecclesiæ, Domini nostri Papæ & successorum prædictorum conservare, defendere, augere, & promovere curabo.* I will take care to preserve, defend, increase, and promote the Rights, Honours, Privileges, and Authority of the Roman Church, and of our Lord the Pope and his Successors aforesaid; but lest this should not be full enough, there follows another Clause, *Nec ero in Concilio, in factò, seu tractatu, in quibus contra Dominum nostrum, vel Romanam Ecclesiam, aliqua sinistra sive præjudicialia personarum, juris, honoris, status, & potestatis eorum, machinentur.* Et, si talia à quibusdam tractari cognovero, aut procurari, impediam hoc pro posse; & quantocyus potero commode significabo eidem Domino nostro, vel alteri per quem ad ipsius notitiam possit pervenire. I will not be in any Council, Action, or Debate, in which they shall plot or contrive any thing to the Prejudice of our Lord the Pope or the Roman Church, or of any Persons, Right, Honor, State or Power, belonging to them. Was not this now a fit Oath to send Bishops to a free Council with? where the main thing to have been debated had been the usurped Power of the Pope and Church of Rome. He that can believe a Council made up of such Persons (who judge this Oath lawful) to be Free, may think those Men free to rebel against their Sovereign, who had but just taken an Oath of Allegiance to him. Not that the Pope had any Right or Power to impose it, or that the Oath is in it self lawful; but that those who judged both these things true, could not possibly be more obliged, not to act in any measure against the Pope than they were. And therefore the Pope knew what he did, when he utterly denied to absolve the Bishops of this Oath, which the States of the Empire pressed him to, as necessary in order to the Freedom of the Council: No, said he, I do not mean to have my Hands bound up so. He knew well enough, how much his Interest lay at Stake, if the Bishops were released of this Oath, and therefore he was resolved to hold them fast enough to himself by it. What Restrictions or Limitations can you now find out in this Oath, whereby these Bishops might freely debate the Power and Authority of the Bishop of Rome? They that swear, *not to be in any Council or Debate against the Pope*, are not like to make any Free Council about the matters then in Dispute. And, Do you think now the Protestants had no cause to except against this Council, where all the Bishops were sworn before-hand to maintain and defend that which they most complained of? And, Were there nothing else but this Oath, so unheard of a thing in all ancient Councils, so contrary to the ends of a Free Council; this were enough to keep them from ever submitting to the Judgment of such a Council as that of Trent was.

And yet this is not all neither; for his Lordship adds, *That the Pope himself, to shew his Charity, had declared and pronounced the Appellants Hereticks, before they were condemned by the Council.* I hope, saith he, an Assembly

Assembly of Enemies are no lawful Council; and I think that the Decrees of such a one are, omni jure nulla, and carry their Nullity with them through all Law. All the Answer you give to this, is, *That the Pope did nothing therein but in pursuance of the Canons of the Church which required him so to do, and of the Decrees of General Councils, which had already condemned their Opinions for Heresie.* You mend the matter well; for it seems the Pope not only did so, but was bound to do so. For shame then never talk of a *Free and General Council*, to debate those things which you say were already condemned for Heresies by *General Councils*. One may now see, What the *safe Conduct* had been for the *Protestants*, if they had come to *Trent*; for it seems they were condemned for *Hereticks* before they came there, and nothing then was wanting but Execution. But if the *Protestants* Opinions were condemned for *Heresies* before by *General Councils*, Why was the *Council of Trent* at all summoned? Why was the World so deceived with the Promises of a *Free and General Council*? Why did they proceed to make new *Decrees* in these matters? In what ancient *general Councils* will you shew us the *Pope's Supremacy*, the *Infallibility* of the *Church of Rome* decreed, that those who held the contrary should be accounted *Hereticks*? Speak them out, that we may find our selves therein condemned. Give us a *Catalogue* of the rest of your *Tridentine Articles*, and name us the *general Councils* in which they were decreed as they are there? But this is not a work for you to meddle in. However, What Folly and Madness would it be to account that a *Free Council*, in which the Things to be debated are looked on as condemned *Heresies* already, and no Liberty allowed to any Persons to debate them?

Ibid.

The last Exception you say of his Lordship, is, *against the small Number of Bishops present at the Tridentine Council; and in the first Place he mentions the Greeks whom he takes (say you) to have been unjustly excluded.* To this you say, 1. *The Pope called all who had right to come? (you should say, all whom he would judge to have right to come).* 2. *The Greeks, by reason of their notorious Schism, had excluded themselves:* And, Might not the *Greeks* (if they were in Condition) every whit as well hold a *general Council* among themselves, and say, The *Latins* had excluded themselves by their notorious *Schism*? You say, *It is confessed that no known Heretick or Schismatick, hath right to sit in Council;* but still you make your own selves Judges, Who are *Orthodox*, and who *Hereticks* and *Schismaticks*; and, Might not the *Greeks* again say the very same of you? And for all that I know, with much more Truth and reason. It was then very like to be a *general Council*, when the *Pope* and his Party must sit as *Judges*, Who were to be admitted, and who not: Might not the *Donatists* in *Africa* have call'd their *Council of seventy Bishops* an *Oecumenical Council* upon the same Grounds, because they accounted none to belong to the *Church*, but such as were of their own Party? And if they did not belong to the *Church*, they could have no right to sit in *Council*. It seems, the more uncharitable you are, the freer your *Councils* are; For the *Pope* may, by pronouncing Men *Hereticks* and *Schismaticks*, keep them from coming to *Councils*, and appearing against him there; and the *Council* be never the less *General* for all that. If the *Greeks* be not called to the *Council*, they may thank themselves, they are *notorious Schismaticks*, and, if we believe you, *Hereticks* too; If the *Protestants* be not admitted, it is their own Fault they are condemned *Hereticks*; if none appear from any other more remote *Churches*, still the same Plea will serve to exclude them all. For my part I much approve the

Q. II.
Ibid.

P. 234.

the saying of *Eugenius* in the Council of Florence, when they spake of the paucity of *Bishops* for a *General Council*, That where he and the Emperour, and the Patriarch of Constantinople were present, there was a *General Council*, though there were no more. And Pope Pius the fourth might have saved a great deal of money in his Purse, with which he maintained his *Bishops Errant* at that Council, had he been of the same mind. But the Scene of things was altered in Europe; there were such Clamours made for a *General Council*, that something must be done to satisfy the World; and, as long as the Pope knew how to manage the Business, there would be nothing could breed so great danger in it. He therefore barely summons a Council, without acquainting any of the *Eastern Patriarchs* with it (as was the Custom in the ancient *General Councils*) among whom it was debated after the Emperour's indicting of it; these summoned by the Emperour's Order their *Metropolitans*, the *Metropolitans* the *Bishops*; the *Bishops* they agreed among themselves, who should go to the Council, who on that Account might be said to represent those Churches from whence they came. What was there like this in the Council of Trent? What Messages were there sent to the *Eastern Patriarchs of Constantinople, Antioch and Alexandria*? What *Metropolitans* came thence? What *Bishops* by the Consent of those Churches? And, if there were nothing of all this, What Boldness is it to call this a *General Council*? Just by the same Figure that your Church is called the Catholick Church; which is, by an insufferable *Catachresis*. And must six fugitive *Greek Bishops* give Vote here for all the *Eastern Churches*; and two fugitive *English Bishops* for all the Church of England? I do not then at all wonder, How easily this might be a *general Council*, though there were so very few Persons in most of the *Sessions* of it. But you say, *There was no need of any particular sending from the Greeks, as the Case then stood, and still continues; 'tis sufficient they were called by the Pope.* Sufficient indeed for your Purpose; but not at all for a *general Council*; For if the *Greek Churches* had been in Condition to have sent an equal number of *Eastern to Western Bishops*, the *Popes* would rather have lost all, than stood to the Judgment of such a Council. And this you know well enough, for all your saying, *That the Greek Church condemns the Protestants*: You dread the *Greek Churches* meeting you in a *Free General Council*; and therefore to prevent that, they must be called *Schismatics*, and excluded as such, though you would never permit the debate of the *Schism* in a *Free Council*. As the Case then stood, and still continues, there was no need of sending. And, Why so? Is it because those Churches were then under Persecutions, and are still, and therefore there is no Hopes that the *Bishops* should come to a *general Council*? But all that thence follows, is, that as things stood then, and do still, there can be no truly *general Council*; and that is a just Inference: but I suppose you rather mean, because those Churches were then in *Schism*, and are still, which still discovers what a wonderful good Opinion you have of your selves, and how uncharitable you are to all others. And so great is the Excellency of your *Bishops*, that one of them may represent a whole Nation; and so about fifty will be more than sufficient for the whole World. And therefore I rather wonder there were so many *Bishops* at Trent; for, if the Pope pleased, as he made *Patriarchs, Primates, and Arch-Bishops* of such Places where they never durst go (which he knew well enough) it had been but appointing such to stand for such a Nation, and such for another, and a small number might have served turn, without putting any to the trouble of coming from any foreign Countreys at all. For otherwise, if we go about to examine the

the numbers of *Bishops*, by their Proportions to the *Churches* they come from, as it ought to be in *General Councils*, we shall find a most pitiful Account in the *Council of Trent*.

For as his Lordship saith, *Is it to be accounted a General Council, that in many Sessions had scarce ten Arch-Bishops, or forty or fifty Bishops present? In all the Sessions under Paul III. but two Frenchmen, and sometimes none; as in the sixth, under Julius III. when Henry II. of France protested against that Council. And from England but one or two (by your own Confession) and those not sent by Authority. And the French (he saith) held off till the Cardinal of Lorrain was got to Rome. As for the Spaniards, they laboured for many things upon good grounds, but were most unworthily over born.* Now to this you have a double Answer ready, 1. *That Mission or Deputation, is not of absolute necessity, but only of Canonical Provision, when time or state of the Countreys whence Bishops are sent, will permit; in other Cases, it sufficeth, they be called by the Pope.* 2. *For those who were absent, the Impediment was not on the Councils part; and in the latter Sessions (wherein all that had been formerly defined by the Council, was de Novo confirmed and ratified by the unanimous consent of all the Prelates) 'tis manifest, the Council was so full, that in the number of Bishops it exceeded some of the first four General Councils.* I begin with your first Answer, which necessarily implies, that a *General Council* is not so called by *Representation* of the whole Church, but by relation to the *Pope's Summons*. So that if the *Pope* make a *General Summons*, that must be called a *General Council*, though none be present but such whom the *Pope* shall think fit to call thither. But, Where do you find any such Account of a *General Council* in all *Antiquity*? I have given you Instances already of *General Councils*, in which the *Popes* had nothing at all to do with the summoning of them; nay, all the four *General Councils* were called by the *Emperour*, and not by the *Pope*, as any one may see, that doth not wilfully blind himself. The *Pope* sometimes did beseech and intreat the *Emperour* to call a *Council*, but never presumed to do it himself in those Days. And this is evident, not only from the *Historians*, but from the authentick *Acts* of the *Councils* themselves; and *Cardinal Perron's* distinction of the *temporal and spiritual Call of Councils*, is as ill grounded as the *Pope's temporal and spiritual Power*; there being no Foundation at all in *Antiquity*, nor any reason in the thing, for two such several Calls, the one by the *Emperour*, and the other by the *Pope*. But this is a meer Evasion, the Evidence being so clear, as to the *Emperor's* calling those *Councils*, the *Nicene* by *Constantine*, the *Constantinopolitan* by *Theodosius*, the *Ephesine* by the *Junior Theodosius*, the *Chalcedonian* by *Martian* and *Valentinian*: And this is so clear, that *Bellarmino* in his *Recognitions* confesseth his mistake about the *Constantinopolitan Council* being called by the *Letters of Pope Damasus*; and acknowledges that to be true, which I at large proved before, *That the Synodical Epistle was not sent by the General Council, but by another the Year after.* If then the calling of *Councils* belongs not of right to the *Pope*, it is not his summoning which can make a *General Council*, without *Mission* and *Deputation* from those *Churches* whom they are to represent. And any other sense of a *General Council* is contrary to the sense of *Antiquity*, and is forced, and unreasonable in it self. For it must be either absolutely *general*, or by *representation*; none ever imagined yet an absolutely *General Council*, and therefore it must be so called as it doth represent; if so, then there is a necessity of such a *Deputation*. But here a *Question* might arise, Whether those *Deputies* of *Churches* have power by their own votes to oblige the *Churches* they are sent from, by convening in

a general Council; or else only as they carry with them the sense of those Churches whom they represent; and this latter seems more agreeable to the Nature of a truly General Council, whose Acts must oblige the whole Church. For that can only be said to be the act of the whole Church, which is done by the Bishops delivering the Sense of all particular Churches; and it is not easie to understand, How the Universal Church can be obliged any other way; unless it be proved, that General Councils are instituted by some positive Law of Christ: so that what is done by the Bishops in them, must oblige the Catholick Church; and then we must find out not only the Institution it self, but the way and manner how General Councils should be called, of which the Scripture is wholly silent. And therefore there is no reason that there should be any other General Council imagined, but by such a Representation; and in order to this, the consent of all those Churches must be known by the particular Bishops, before they can concur with others, so as to make a General Council. The most suitable way then to a General Council, is, that the Summons of them being published by the consent of Christian Princes, every Prince may call together a National Synod, in which the matters to be debated in the Council, are to be discussed, and the sense of that Synod fully declared, which those Bishops who are appointed by it to go to the General Council, are to carry with them, and there to declare the Sense of their particular Church, and what all these Bishops so assembled do all agree in, as the Sense of the whole Church, may be called the decree of a General Council. Or in case some great Impediment happen, that such Bishops cannot assemble from all Churches, but a very considerable number appearing and declaring themselves, which upon the first notice of it, is universally received by all particular Churches, that may *ex post-facto* be called a General Council; as it was with the first four Oecumenical Councils. And yet that in them there was such a Deputation as this is, appears by that Expression in the Synodical Epistle of the Bishops of Constantinople before mentioned; for in that they give this Account, Why they could not do what the Western Bishops desired, because they brought not with them the consent of the Bishops, who remained at home to that Purpose. Καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα, ὡς τῆς συνόδου, τὴν τῶν ἐν τῇ ἐπαρχίᾳ μὲν ὄντων ἐπισκόπων συγκαταθεσὶν ἐπαρξάμενοι. And concerning this only Council, viz. at Constantinople, have we brought the consent of those Bishops which remain in the Provinces. So that they looked on the Consent of the other Bishops, to be necessary as well as their own. But now, if we examine your Council of Trent by this Rule, How far is it from any Appearance of a General Council? What Bishops were there sent from the most of Christian Churches? Those that did appear, What Equality and Proportion was there among them? For Voices in General Councils ought not to go by the number of Bishops, but by the number of Churches; so that if six were sent from the Church of England, or France, delivering the Sense of that Church they come from, they have equal Votes with the greatest number of Italian Bishops. But here lay the great Imposture of that Council; first, that the Councils being general, depended upon the Pope's general Summons, though never so few Bishops appeared; next, that the Decrees of the Council were to be carried by most Voices, and the Bishops to give their bare *placet*; these things being thus laid, when there was any fear that Business would not go right, it was but the Legate's using some Art in delaying it, and sending Intelligence to Rome, and forty Bishops are made together, and posted to Trent, to help out the number of Voices; and thus it was in the Case of the Institution and Residence of Bishops: And this is that you call, a

general

general Council. 2. To your other, *That what was wanting in number at first, was made up at last when all former Decrees were confirmed by a full number of Bishops*; it is soon replied, *That this is, as all the rest of the Proceedings of that Council was, but a meer Artifice.* For it appears by the *History of* Hist. Council of Trent. l. 8. p. 804. that Council, that in the last Session under Pius IV. a Proposition was made, that all the Decrees under Paul and Julius should be approved; which was opposed, because they said it would be a derogation to the Authority of the Council of those times, if it should seem that the things then done had need of a new confirmation of the Fathers, and would shew, that this and that was not all one, because none can confirm his own things. But upon the French Bishops earnest insisting upon it, it was determined simply to read them, and no more. And, Do you call this a confirming and ratifying them de novo? So that, for all appears by this last Session the Authority of those Decrees, must, as far as concerns the Council, depend upon the number of the Bishops then present, which was but very small certainly for a general Council, there being not so many in most of the Sessions, as were in the Donatists Council in Africa; so far were they from the number of the ancient General Councils.

But here comes your grand Objection in the way, *That nothing is pretended by us against the Council of Trent, which might not have been in effect* ibid. n. 4. as justly objected by the Arrians against the Council of Nice. But, Is not there easily discernible a vast Disparity between these two, which way soever we conceive them? The one called by the Emperor, who in Person sat in the Council, to prevent all Disorders and clancular Actions; the other by the Pope, who presided in it by his Legates, and ordered all things by his Directions. In that of Nice, the Arrian Bishops were as freely admitted to debate, as any of the other; but it was far from being so at the Council of Trent. In the Nicene Council, though Alexander was no further a Party as to the Doctrine than the other Bishops (no more was Leo at the Council of Chalcedon, or Cyril at Ephesus, though those are the three you instance in before) yet he sat not as President of the Council, but the Emperour had the chief Inspection for the right management of it, and for the Conciliar Actions Hosius was President: Would the Pope have been contented with such a Council in his Case, wherein the Emperor should have sat in chief, and some other Person besides the Pope to have presided? If not, never go about to parallel these two Councils with each other. Again, in the Council of Nice, all the Bishops came free, without any Pre-engagement to maintain the Party of Alexander; but the Bishops at Trent were all sworn to defend the Papal Interest. At Nice, the Bishops themselves debated the matters in Controversie; at Trent, the Divines dispute, the Bishops in their Formalities give their Placet. At Nice, every one was freely heard, none died for Grief of Checks being given them for their too free speaking, as there did at Trent. And these, I hope, shew, there was much greater Reason for the Protestants to except against the Council of Trent, than for the Arrians against the Council of Nice. And yet, besides all these Grounds of Disparity, those two remain good still, which his Lordship instanceth in, viz. *That the Council of Nice proceeded wholly by the Scripture, and that the Sentence of it hath been universally received by the Church, both before and after it*; neither of which can be said of the Council of Trent. But to these two you offer something by way of Answer. To the first, *That both these Councils had the Scripture for their Rule, but not their only Rule*; for, you say, P. 235. Hist. l. 1. cap. 8. Theodoret expressly says, that in condemning the Arrian Heresie, the Council

Council of Nice grounded it self upon Tradition. But Theodorat says no such thing; only out of an Epistle of Athanasius, he says, *When the Arrians objected that they used Words not contained in Scripture, they gave them this Answer, that so did they too; but the Words which they used, were such as their Fathers had used before them; and, Do you call this the grounding the Condemnation of them upon Tradition?* Yet, to do you right, I must suppose that either you took this upon trust, without searching Theodorat; or, if you did, you looked no further than Christophorson's Translation, which in things concerning the *Papal Controversies*, doth notoriously trip (to say no worse of it, as it were easie to manifest from several Examples) but we need no more than this at present. For whereas the Words in Greek run thus, *Ἐξ ἀγροῶν γὰρ ἀσκήσαντες (ἀγροῶν δὲ τὸ ἐξ ἑκ ἁπλῶς, καὶ τὸ ἥν ποτε ὅτε ἐκ ἡν) αἰνῶν) ἐκ ἀγροῶν μὲν εὐσεβείας ἐννοούμενων λέξεων κατελείδουσιν.* Which Sirmondus faithfully renders, *Nam cum ipsi ex verbis non-scriptis impietatem suam adstruxerint: (nusquam enim scriptum reperias Ex non extantibus; aut, Erat quando non erat;) accusant quod per voces non-scriptas, pie tamen excogitatas, condemnati sint, i. e.* Though the Arrians made use of unwritten Words themselves; yet they accused their Adversaries for condemning them by unwritten Words; meaning the *ὁμοούσιον*. But Christophorson translates *αἰνῶν*, *afferunt* and there ends the Sentence, and then makes a new Sentence. *Quapropter ex non-scriptis vocibus, pie tamen excogitatis, condemnati sunt.* By this we see, What necessity there is of searching your Citations in Antiquity, which you deliver with so much Confidence, as though none had ever looked into the Fathers but your selves. But I find you so often tripping in your Quotations, that where Bellarmine hath been abused by the Latin Interpreter, you very securely follow him in it; as in another place mentioned in this Chapter, where Christophorson renders *ἐκ τῶν πέντε χαρμῶν, mandato literarum*, which Bellarmine confidently cites, as importing Damasus his Power to summon the Council of Constantinople, than which nothing can be further from the meaning of those Words. Thus you see, how vain your Attempt is, of proving that the Council of Nice grounded her Definition on Tradition, as the Council of Trent did, which is directly contrary to the Advice of Constantine, and the Proceedings of the Council, as his Lordship truly told you. To the second concerning the consent of the Church, you answer, *That the like consent of the Church both is, and was, when Protestants first began.* But, Will this reach to a Parity, if it were granted? For his Lordship speaks of the Consent of the Church in all Ages, from the Primitive and Apostolical Times. I pray, prove your Mass, Invocation of Saints, Worship of Images, Purgatory, &c. by such a Consent as this, and then you may say, There is no such Disparity between them: As to what you further add of the Council of Nice, condemning the *Quartodecimani* for Hereticks, I know not where you will find it, I am sure Constantine is far from saying so in his Epistle perswading to Union as to that matter. Cannot the Council of Nice appoint Time to celebrate Easter? Or determine, that those who come from Hereticks, shall not be rebaptized, but they must presently condemn all who do otherwise, for Hereticks? But you must be pardoned; you are proving a Parity between the Council of Nice and Trent, and you know you could not do that sufficiently, unless they condemned all Dissenters in any Punctilio, for Hereticks.

Q. 14.
P. 218.

His Lordship further proves, *That Trent could be no indifferent Council to the Church, the Pope having made himself a strong Party in it; because there were more Italian Bishops there, than of all Christendom besides; yea more than*

than double. For where the Number of Prelates is expressed that had Suffrage and Vote in that Council, the Italians are set down to be a hundred eighty seven, and all the rest make but eighty three, so that there were more Italian Bishops by a hundred and four, than of all the rest of Christendom; sure (saith he) the Pope did not mean to be over-reached in this Council. And whatsoever became of his Infallibility otherwise, he might this way be sure to be Infallible in whatsoever he would have determined. And this without all doubt is all the Infallibility he hath. To this you answer, That the Pope's making a Party, is disproved by the very Argument he brings to assert it, viz. the Multitude of Italian Prelates: for, Who knows not, that the Italians are more divided in point of Interest and Dependence, than in any other Nation of Christendom, by Reason of the many Sovereign Principalities and States, into which Italy is divided? But, What is this to the purpose, unless you could prove that the Italian Prelates were so divided in point of Interest and Dependence? Since therefore they have all their Dependence on the Pope, and not on those Principalities in which they live; this Evasion, though very slight, is yet the best your Cause would bear. And the greater you say, the Number of Bishopricks is in Italy, the more Friends, I hope, the Pope must make by disposing them; and, Could they do the Pope better Service, than to help him in this grand Business at Trent, wherein they sought to outvie each other by promoting the Pope's Interest? But not only the Protestants complained of this, but the Emperor and other Princes, and all impartial Men in Germany, France? nay, and in some Parts of Italy too. But here his Lordship encounters an Objection of Bellarmine, viz. that in the Council of Nice there were as few Bishops of the West present, as were of the East at Trent, and manifestly shews the great Disparity between the two Councils.

1. Because it is not a meer Disparity in Number which he insists on, but with it the Pope's Carriage, to be sure of a major part; but neither the Greek Church in general, nor any Patriarch of the East, had any private Interest to look to, in the Council at Nice.
2. It was not so much a Disparity between the Eastern and Western Bishops, but that there were so many more Italians and Bishops obnoxious to the Pope's Power, than of all Germany, France, Spain, and of all other Parts of the West besides.
3. Even in the Comparison of those two Councils, as to Eastern and Western Bishops, there is this remarkable difference, that Pope Sylvester with 275. Bishops confirmed the Council at Nice, but the Council at Trent was never confirmed by any Council of Eastern Bishops.

To the two first of these you Answer with your best Property, Silence. Only you would fain persuade some silly People (if there be any so weak in the World that enquire into such Things) That the Pope had no private Interest at Trent, but what was common to him with other Bishops. You should have done well to have commended the Excellency of an *implicite Faith*, before you had uttered a thing so contrary to the Sense of the whole Christian World. To the third you confess, It is some Disparity, but nothing to the purpose, because if the Pope himself had ratified them, the Council would have had as much Authority as by that accessory Assembly. The more to blame was the Pope a great deal, for putting so many Bishops to so needless a Trouble. But you say further, This Council was not held just at the same time. But *Binius* tells you, it was held as soon as might be, after the Notice of what was done at Nice; shew us the like of the Eastern Bishops at any time, and we will not quarrel with you, because it was not at the same time: Though these Answers may pass for want of better, they come not near your last, which

P. 236.

P. 220.

P. 237.

Tom. 1. Conc.
P. 449.

Ibid.

which is a prodigious one, the Sense of it being, *That the Doctrine of Faith defined by the Council of Trent was more universally received in the Church, than that of the Council of Nice.* For that of Trent, you say, was universally received by the whole Catholick Church, and hath been more constantly held ever since; whereas many Provinces, either in whole or in part, deserted the Faith defined at Nice, and embraced the Arrian Heresie. It seems then, the twelve good Articles of Trent have been more generally received by the Catholick Church, than the eternal Existence of the Son of God; and consequently, that you are more bound to believe the Doctrine of Purgatory, or Transubstantiation, than that the Son is of the same Substance with the Father: For your Grounds of Faith being resolved into the Churches Infallibility, you cannot believe that which hath been so much questioned in the Church, so firmly as that which hath been universally believed and constantly held. But the universal Reception of the Doctrine of the Council of Trent by the whole Catholick Church, is so intolerable a Falshood, that you would scarce have vented it, unless it were your design to write for the Whetstone.

P. 221.

Ibid. n. 3.

Hist. Council
of Trent, l. 7.
p. 683.

To A. C.'s Objection, *That neither French, nor Spanish, nor Schismatical Greeks did agree with the Protestants in those Points which were defined by the Council,* his Lordship answers, *That there can be no certainty, who did agree, and who not, (or who might have agreed before the Council ended) because they were not admitted to a fair and free Dispute.* And it may be too some Decrees would have been more favourable to them, had not the care of the Pope's Interest made them sower. Here you complain, of his Lordship's falling again to his Surmises, of the Bishops being over-awed by the Pope's Authority in the Council; which you call an empty and injurious Suspicion, an unworthy Accusation, and arguing the want of Christian Charity. But usually when you storm the most, you are the most guilty. For if you call this an empty Suspicion, &c. you charge many more with it besides his Lordship, and those, the greatest of your own Communion; what meant else, the frequent Protestations of the French and Spanish Ambassadors, in which they often declared, that as things were managed, the Council was not Free? What meant those Words of the Emperor Ferdinand, in his Letters to the Legates and the Pope? *That the Liberty of the Council was impeached chiefly by three Causes: one, because every thing was first consulted of at Rome: another, because the Legates had assumed to themselves only the Liberty of proposing, which ought to be common to all: the third, because of the Practices which some Prelates interested in the Greatness of the Court of Rome did make.* The French Ambassadour, Monsieur de Lansac writ to the King his Master, *That the Pope was so much Master of this Council, that his Pensioners whatsoever the Emperors or we do remonstrate to them, will do but what they list.* Several of the like Nature might easily be produced, so that it is not his Lordship only is guilty of this want of Charity (as you call it) but all impartial Persons, who were most acquainted with the Affairs of that Council. Whose Judgment is certainly much more to be taken than such who have sworn to defend it. But you have an excellent Argument to prove the Council Free, *because the Bishops of the Council continued in the Faith and Doctrine of it as long as they lived.* And had they not good Reason to do so, when they were sworn before-hand to defend the Pope, and having secured him from danger of Reformation by the Council, and subscribed the Decrees of it, they were as much bound to defend their own Acts. And although it is well enough known what Practices

etices were used to bring off the *French* and *Spanish Bishops*; yet when they were brought off, what a Shame would it have been for them to have revolted from their own *Subscriptions*? But what is this to that General Freedom which was desired by the *Roman Catholick Princes* for Reformation of the *Court of Rome*, and by *Protestants* both of the *Court* and *Church*? Was the *Council* any thing the more free, because that Party which met there continued in what they had done? Just, as if a part of a *Common-Council* should suffer only such Persons to come there whom they thought fit, and suffer nothing to be debated, but what two or three of the leading Men should propound, and yet this be call'd a free *Common-Council*, because they who were of it, did after they had done, persist in it? And this is all you have to plead for the *Freedom* of the *Council of Trent*.

Touching the *Greek Church*, and the Writings of the *Patriarch Hieremias*, it is to little purpose, to say, *That they differ from us in several things*, unless you could prove, that they did agree with you in all. And if (as you say) *they do condemn Protestantism*, you cannot but know they do much more condemn *Popery*; and that in some of the main Articles of it. And therefore we have Reason to believe, that you more dread a *Free Council*, wherein the *Greek Churches* may be admitted to equal Votes with the *Latin*, than the *Protestants* do the Judgment of the *Greek Church*. For it is sufficiently known, how much the *Greeks* agree with us in the Opposition to the great Points of the *Pope's Supremacy*, and the *Infallibility of the Church of Rome*; how far they are from the belief of *Purgatory* in your Sense, and several other things which are contained in the *Decrees of the Council of Trent*: If the *Patriarch Hieremias* did not in all things agree with the *Lutheran Divines*, doth it thence follow, that he would subscribe to the *Council of Trent*? But because you pretend to give us a full Account of the Proceedings, between the *Patriarch Hieremias*, and the *Lutheran Divines*, we must a little further enquire into them. You tell us then, *That about the end of the last Century, some eminent Protestants of the Lutheran Party, endeavoured to feel the Pulse of the Greek Church, to see if they could there find any Symptoms of their own Disease. The Design was (you say) to close with the Greeks, for the better making out the pretended perpetual Succession of their Church; which Project they so hotly pursued, though formerly in vain attempted, that they would not desist till the Patriarch being settled in his Throne, they had sent him the sum of their reformed Belief, drawn up according to the Augustane Confession. After a long intercourse of Letters, Answers, and replies mutually continued for some Tears, and all Arguments used that might induce the Patriarch to receive them into his Communion, he could not be courted to so much as the least shew of approving their Doctrine: but did in all his Answers clearly confirm the Tenets of the Roman Catholick Church, which those Lutherans endeavoured to overthrow. In so much, that the Patriarch tired with their Importunity, gave them a Rebuke for their Departure from the Doctrine of the Catholick Church, and desired them not to trouble him any more with their Writings.* A very formal Story! One would expect the next News should have been, that the *Patriarch* had come to kiss his *Holiness's Feet*, or at least subscribed to the *Council of Trent*. But all your Stories out of the *East* have not so much Truth as Formality in them: witness one for all, that solemn *Legation* from *Gabriel Patriarch of Alexandria*, to *Pope Clement 8*, wherein an Acknowledgment was made of the *Pope's Supremacy as Head of the Church*; upon which, such Joy was conceived

p. 15.

P. 238.

Thuan. hist.
l. 114. ad A.
1595.
Thom. à Jesu
de Convers.
omn. gent. l. 7.
c. 6. p. 364.

Hottinger.
Archæolog.
Orient. cap. 3.
p. 69.

Apud Chytræ.
de statu Eccl.
Orient. p. 122.

conceived at *Rome*, that *Baronius* unmeasurably triumphs upon it, and says, it tends as much to the Joy of *Catholicks*, as to the Confusion of *Hereticks*; and therefore hath very solemnly published the *Legation* it self at the end of the sixth *Tome* of his *Annals*; but upon a further Examination of it, it was all found to be a meer Fiction and Imposture of one *Barton*, as both *Thuanus* and *Thomas à Jesu* confess. But we must suppose no such danger in this Story, for you tell us, *You have it from Spondanus, and he out of the Writings of those Protestants themselves*: but I much rather believe by the Circumstances of your Story, that either you, or *Spondanus*, had it from *Socolovius* their virulent Adversary, who having clancularly procured a Copy of the *Patriarch's* Answer, he publishes it in *Latin* with the Title of *Censura Orientalis Ecclesiæ*, and gives much the same account as you do here. In which there are two grand Mistakes, first, as to the *Design*, which you say, was to be admitted into *Communion with the Greek Church*: The second, as to the *Event*, which you say was, *That the Patriarch did not shew the least Approbation of their Doctrine, but did in all his Answers confirm the Tenets of the Roman Catholick Church*. Both which, how notoriously false they are, will presently appear by a full Account of the Circumstances of this Affair. We must know then, that the News of the *Lutherans* appearing in *Germany* against the *Pope* being spread at *Constantinople*, great enquiry was made what their Doctrine was, and they were represented (by whose Arts one may easily guess) as Men holding strange Opinions, denying the *Divinity of Christ*, &c. as appears by a Letter lately published of a *Divine* about that time resident in *Constantinople*; and withal, that they were defamed generally as Persons of *no Religion at all*, and of *wicked and flagitious Lives*; upon this, those *German Divines* send by *Stephanus Gerlachius*, Chaplain to the *Emperor's* Ambassador, a *Greek Copy* of the *Augustane Confession*, *Martinus Crusius* having before sent a Letter only of Respect to the *Patriarch Hieremias*; who by the means of *Cantacuzenus* was made *Patriarch* in the room of *Metrophanes*, who was then deposed. *Gerlachius*, as appears by a Letter of his dated *May 24. A. 1575.* carries the Copy of the *Augustane Confession* to the *Patriarch*, who then had his Council about him, which with great Joy and Delight, he saith, he read in the Presence of them, and delivered it to be read to the *Priests* and *Calogeri*; but five Points he selected out of it to be further discussed, and when afterwards he waited on the *Patriarch* to know his Judgment concerning it, *Johannes Zygomalas*, who was then the *Rhetor Patriarchicus*, a kind of *Chancellor* to him, told him, that having read it almost all over, they approved almost all, except that about *Procession of the Holy Ghost from the Son*, and *unleavened Bread*; but he particularly desired the *Patriarch* to return an Answer to the *Divines*, who sent it with his Judgment upon it; and having spoken with the *Metropolitan of Nice* and others, they seemed very much pleased with that *Confession*. With the *Patriarch's* Letter *Johannes Zygomalas* writes to *Martin Crusius*, and therein tells him, that though in all things the *Patriarch* did not assent to them; yet it might be evident to all

ὡς ἐν τοῖς περὶ ἁγίου πνεύματος καὶ συνεκκλησιάζουσιν τῆς πίστεως συμφωνούμεν, that they did agree in the most important Articles of Christian Faith; and that in other things they might easily agree, if they left the new and strange Customs, and adhered to the *Catholick Church with them*, and there was the greater hopes of it ἐκείνων συμφωνούντων τῷ τῆς πρεσβυτέρου Ῥώμης ἀρχιερεῖ, ἢ τῇ καὶ αὐτὸν ἐκκλησίᾳ, ἀλλὰ μάλλον ἐκατέρων ἀποφασισμένων ταῖς καιαῖς ἀπὸ συνδείας καὶ παραχρήσεων, Since neither part did agree with the *Bishop of old Rome*, or the *Church which joins with him*, but both oppose the

evil

evil Customs and Abuses which come by him: which bears the same Date with the Patriarchs first Answer to the *Tubing Divines*, May 15. 1576. And the Patriarch in his Letter heartily wishes an Union and Conjunction between them. From hence we may easily gather, how true both those Things were, viz. That the intent of their Writing was, to be admitted into the Communion of the Greek Church, and that the Patriarch did not in the least approve their Doctrine, but confirmed the Tenets of the Roman Catholick Church. But we must look further into the Writings themselves, to see how far they agreed, and wherein they differed. It appears then, that the Patriarch did profess his Consent with them in these Things, besides the Articles of the Creed, and the Satisfaction of Christ, and other more general Points, viz. That the *Primum Pa-*
triar. Resp.
 Sacrament was to be received in both kinds, that the use of Marriage was not to be absolutely forbidden the Clergy, though their Custom is, that they must be married before they take Orders; besides the grand Articles of the Pope's Supremacy, and the Roman Churches Infallibility; Doth he that joyns with them in these Things not in the least approve their Doctrine, but confirm the Tenets of the Roman Catholick Church? But withal, it must be confessed, that besides that common Article of the Procession of the Spirit, wherein he disputes most earnestly; there are five others, in which they dissented from each other, about Free-will, Justification by Faith, the Number of Sacraments, Invocation of Saints, and Monastick Life, and about these the remaining Disputes were. In some of which it is easie to discern how far the right State of the Question was from being apprehended, which the *Lutheran Divines* perceiving sent him a larger and fuller Explication of their Mind in a *Body of Divinity in Greek*; but the Patriarchs troubles coming on, *Cantacuzenus* deposing him too, and other Busineses taking him off upon his Restoration, he breaks off the Conference between them. But although he differed from them in these Things, yet he was far enough from rebuking them for departing from the Roman Church, although he was desirous they should have joined with them in the Approbation of such Things as were in use among themselves. And in those Things in which he seems to plead for some Practices in use in the Roman Church, yet there are many considerable Circumstances about them, wherein they differ from the Church of Rome, as hath been manifested by many others. As in the Article of Invocation of Saints, the Patriarch saith, They do not properly Invoke Saints but God, for neither Peter nor Paul do hear us, upon which ground it is impossible to maintain the *Romish Doctrine* of Invocation of Saints. And in most of the other, the main Difference lies in the want of a true State of the Questions between them. But is this any such great matter of Admiration, that the Patriarch upon the first Sight of their Confession should declare his dissent from them in these things? It is well enough known, how much Barbarism had crept into the Greek Church after their being subdued by the Turks, the means of Instruction being taken from them, and it being very rare at that time to have any Sermons at all, in so much, that one of their *Calogeri* being more learned than the rest, and preaching there in Lent, was thereby under great Suspicion, and at last was by the Patriarch himself sent out of the way. It is therefore more to be wondered they should preserve so much of the Doctrine of Faith entire as they have done, than that any corrupt Practices should prevail amongst them. The most then, which you can make of the Judgment of the Patriarch Hieremias, is, that in some things he was opposite to the Protestants, as in others to the Church of Rome. But what would you have said, if any Patriarch of Constantinople had declared his Consent so fully with the Church

Epist. Remonst.
P. 412.

of Rome, as the Patriarch Cyril did afterwards with the Protestants? who on that account suffered so much by the Practices of the Jesuits, of whom he complains in his Epistle to Utenbogard. And although a Faction was raised against him by Parthenius who succeeded him, yet another Parthenius succeeding him stood up in Vindication of him. Since therefore such different Opinions have been among them about the present Controversies of the Christian World, and there being no declared Confession of their Faith which is owned by the whole Greek Church, as to these things; there can be no confident pronouncing what their Judgment is, as to all our Differences, till they have further declared themselves.

K

PART III.

Of Particular Controversies.

112:27

CHAP. I.

Of the Infallibility of General Councils.

How far this tends to the ending Controversies. Two distinct Questions concerning the Infallibility, and Authority of General Councils. The first entred upon, with the State of the Question. That there can be no certainty of Faith that General Councils are infallible; nor that the particular Decrees of any of them are so: which are largely proved. Pighius his Arguments against the Divine Institution of General Councils. The Places of Scripture considered, which are brought for the Churches Infallibility, and that these cannot prove that General Councils are so; Matth. 18. 20. Acts 15. 28. particularly answered. The Sense of the Fathers in their high Expressions of the decrees of Councils. No consent of the Church as to their Infallibility. The place of St. Austin about the Amendment of former General Councils by latter, at large vindicated. No other places in St. Austin prove them infallible, but many to the contrary General Councils cannot be infallible in the Conclusion, if not in the use of the Means. No such Infallibility, without as immediate a Revelation as the Prophets and Apostles had: taking Infallibility not for an absolute unerring Power, but such as comes by a Promise of Divine Assistance preserving from Error. No Obligation to internal Assent, but from immediate Divine Authority. Of the Consistency of Faith and Reason in things propounded to be believed. The suitableness of the contrary Doctrine to the Romanists Principles.

§. 1.

IF high Pretences and large Promises were the only things, which we ought to value any Church for, there were none comparable to the Church of Rome. For there can be nothing imagined amiss in the Christian World, but, if we believe the Bills her Factors set up, she hath an Infallible Cure for it. If any enquire into the Grounds of Religion, they tell us, That her Testimony only can give them Infallible Certainty; if any are afraid of mistaking in Opinions, they have the only Infallible Judge of Controversies to go to; if any complain of the Rents and Divisions of the Christian World, they have Infallible

ble Councils either to prevent or heal them. Who then would not run into the bosom of such a *Church* as this, with whom there is nothing but what is *Infallible*? Who but *Scepticks*, *Hereticks*, and *Schismatics* would keep out of her Communion? For what is there, Men can desire more in a *Church* than she hath, where every thing is so *Infallible*? *Faith* is *Infallible*, *Tradition* *Infallible*, the *Church* *Infallible*, the *Pope* *Infallible*, *General Councils* *Infallible*, and what not? But who are there that more cheat and deceive the World, than those *Mountebanks*, who pretend to the most *Infallible Cures*? For, what is wanting in *Truth* and *Reality* must be helped out with the greater *Confidence*; and so we shall find it to be in these *Infallible Pretenders*, who fall short in nothing more than where they lay the highest Claim to *Infallibility*. Thus we have already manifested, that none have more weakened *Faith*, than such who have given out, that they only could make it *Infallibly certain*, none have brought more *Errors* than that *Church* which arrogates to her self, that she is *Infallible*; it now remains, that we discover that nothing is further from promoting the *Churches Peace*, than this present Pretence of the *Infallibility of General Councils*. For the ending of *Controversies* was the occasion of this Dispute; but this Dispute it self hath caused more. And will do so, as long as Men desire to see Reason for what they do. For it cannot be expected, that Men should yield their Judgments up to the Decrees of every such Combination of Men as shall call it self a *General Council*, unless it be evidently proved, that it is impossible they should err in those *Decrees*. Where there be no other ways found out for the ending some great *Controversies* of the *Church*, but by a free and *General Council*, all wise Men will value the *Churches Peace* so far as not to oppose the *Determinations* of it; it being the highest *Court of Appeal* which the *Church* hath. But there is a great deal of Difference between a Submission for Peace sake, in those Things which are not contrary to the *Fundamentals of Faith*, and the assent of the Mind to all the *Decrees* of such a *Council* as in themselves *Infallible*. For, supposing them subject to Error, yet if that Error be not such as doth over-weigh the *Peace* of the *Church*, the *Authority* of it may be so great as to bind Men to a Submission to them. But where they challenge an *internal Assent* by vertue of such *Decrees*, there must be first proved an *impossibility of erring* in them, before any can look on themselves as obliged to give it. And while Men contend about this, that which was mainly aimed at, is lost by these Contentions, which is the *Unity and Peace* of the *Church*. For it is a most fond and unreasonable thing, to suppose, there may not be as great Divisions in the World, about the ways to end *Controversies* as any other. Nay it is apparent, that the greatest *Controversies* this Day in the Christian World are upon this Subject. It is not therefore any high challenge of *Infallibility* in any *Person* or *Council* which must put an end to *Controversies*; for nothing but *Truth* and *Reason* can ever do it, and the more Men pretend to unreasonable Ways of deciding them, instead of ending one they beget many. For the higher the Pretences are, the more all wise Men are apt to suspect them, and to require the more clear and pregnant Evidence for what they say; and if they fail in that, they have Reason to question their *Integrity* much more than if they had contented themselves with more moderate Claims. For it is not saying *Councils are Infallible*, will make Men yield the sooner to their *Determinations*, unless you first convince their Reason by proving that they are so. But if you aim at nothing but the *Churches Peace*, you might save your selves this labour; persuade Men to be meek and humble, sober and rational, and I dare promise you the *Church* shall be more at quiet, than if you could prove all the *Councils* in the World

to

to be *Infallible*. For, will that ever put a stop to the contentious *Spirits* of Men? Will that alter their Tempers, or make them delight in those things which are contrary to them? No, you only offer to apply that *hyfick* to the Foreheads of Men which should be *taken inwards*; if you would endeavour to promote true *Piety* and a *Christian Spirit* in the World, that would tend more to the *Church's Peace* than all your *Contests* about the *Infallibility* of *general Councils*. But since you are resolved to *contend*, the Nature of my Task requires me to follow you, which I shall more cheerfully do, because, in Pretence at least, it is for *Peace sake*.

¶ 2.

This is then the first of those particular Controversies which this last part is designed for the handling of, and which in the Consequence of it, brings in many of those particular *Errors*, which we charge your *Church* with. In handling of which, I must (as I have hitherto done) confine my self to those *Lines* you have drawn for me to direct my Course by. Only in this first, to prevent that Confusion and Tedioufness which your Discourse is subject to, I find it necessary to alter the Method somewhat. For there being two distinct *Questions* treated of, *viz.* Whether *general Councils be Infallible*? And supposing them not *Infallible*, How far they are to be submitted to? You have intermixed these two so together, that it will easily puzzle the Reader to see which of them it is you discourse of. And although I must confess his Lordship hath gone before you in it, as his occasion of entring into it required, yet now the Points coming to be more fully examined, it will be the most natural and easie Method to handle them apart, and to begin first with that of *Infallibility*; for the other supposing the denial of it, it ought to follow the Reasons which are given for that Denial. But although I thus transpose your Method, I assure you it is not with an Intention to skip over anything material, but I shall readily resume the Debate of it in its proper Place. In your Entrance into this Dispute, you give us very little hopes of any great Advantage is like to come by it, because, upon your Principles, it is impossible we should agree about the Requisites to a *general Council*; for his Lordship wishing that a *lawful general Council were called to end Controversies*, you presently say, *A pure one to be sure, if according to his Wish.* Yes, too pure a great deal for you, to be willing to be tryed by.

P. 222.

P. 240.

And when his Lordship professes, *That any general Council shall satisfie him, that is lawfully called, continued, and ended according to the same course, and under the same Conditions, with general Councils observed in the Primitive Church*: You say, *It is too general to be Ingenuous*; you mean, such a Council would be too general for your Purpose; for, you are resolved in your following Words, *not to yield to such a Council wherein all excommunicate Bishops, Hereticks and Schismaticks are not excluded*; which is, in short, to tell us, You are resolved to account none *general Councils*, but such as are wholly of your own Party, in which the *Pope* shall sit as *Judge*. Who are admitted, and Who not; though this be as contrary to Sense and Reason, as it is to the practice of the *Primitive Church*, in those *Councils* which were then called. In which I have already proved, that the *Pope* did not sit as *President*. And, as long as you hold to such unreasonable Conditions, it evidently appears, That your Discourses of *general Councils*, are meerly *delusory*; and, to use your own Words, *Such a general Council as you would have, is a meer nothing* (as to a General and Free Council), *an empty Name to amuse silly People with*; for, you require such Conditions in order to it, as are destructive both to the Freedom, and Being of a *general Council*. If therefore it be true, which you say, *That morally speaking such a general Council, as Protestants would have, is impossible to be had*; it is much more true, that
such

such a *general Council* as you would have, it is most unreasonable we should submit to. For as long as you condemn all other *Bishops*, but those of your own *Church for Out-laws, and Deserters of the Catholick Church*; and give no other reason for it, but because you say so; we thereby see, How absolutely averſe you are from any *Free Council*, and that without any ſhew of juſtice, you condemn all others but your ſelves, without ſuffering them to plead for themſelves in an *indifferent Council*, where both Parties may be equally heard. But it was wiſely ſaid of *Pope Clement VII.* that *general Councils are very dangerous, when the Pope's Authority is called in Queſtion*; and this you know well enough; for, if a *Free Council* were held, the *Pope* himſelf might be found with his Party to be the greateſt *Out-laws and Deserters of the truly Catholick Church*. But in ſuch pack'd *Councils*, where the *Pope* ſits as *Preſident*, and orders all by his *Legates*, I ſhall deſire you once more to ruminate over your own Words; *What Rebel would ever be found criminal, if he might be allowed to be his own Judge*? But of ſuch a kind of *Council* as you would have, I have ſpoken ſufficiently in the precedent Chapter. That which we are now upon, is not the *Hypotheſis*, but the *Theſis*, in which we are to enquire, *Whether ſuch a General Council as you ſuppoſe, be Infallible or no*? His Lordſhip maintains the Negative, and you the Affirmative. Your Opinion then is, *That the Decrees of a general Council confirmed by the Pope, are Infallible, and that the holding of this, is a piece of Catholick Faith; and that it ſecures all the Members of the Church, from erring in any matter of Faith*. For you ſay, *It is not de fide, that the Pope without a Council is Infallible; but, that Pope and Council together are Infallible*, you all along above aſſert to be ſo; and that the *Decrees of general Councils fall nothing ſhort in point of certainty of the Scripture it ſelf; and that the contrary Opinion does actually expoſe and abandon all the adherents to it, to an unavoidable Wavering and Uncertainty in Faith*. Theſe are your own Words, in ſeveral Places which I have laid together, the better to diſcern the State of the *Queſtion*. The main thing then whereon the uſe of *general Councils* depends being, *that this muſt be believed to be de fide, in order to the Certainty of Mens Faith, and Prevention of Errors*; that I may the better ſhew, how insignificant all this Pretext of the *Infallibility of general Councils*, is, I ſhall firſt prove from your own Principles, that this cannot be *de fide*, and then examine the *Grounds* you inſiſt on for the *Proof of their Infallibility*.

I begin with the *Fiſt*, which will ſufficiently demonſtrate, to how little Purpose you talk of this *Infallibility of Councils*, for preventing *uncertainty of Faith*, when you cannot have any *certainty of Faith* at all as to that Principle which muſt prevent it. For, ſuppoſing that really *general Councils are Infallible*; if you cannot give me any reaſons to believe that they are ſo, their Decrees can have no Power over my Underſtanding, to oblige me to aſſent to them. And ſince you ſay, this Principle muſt be held *de fide*, if there be no Foundation at all for ſuch an *Aſſent of Faith* to it, I muſt needs be *uncertain*, whatever the Decrees of thoſe *Councils* be upon your own Principles. If you require an aſſent to the Decrees of *Councils* as Infallible, there muſt be an antecedent Aſſent to this Proposition, *That whatſoever Councils decree, is Infallible*: As I cannot aſſent to any thing as Infallible, which is contained in *Scripture*, unleſs I firſt aſſent to this, *That the Scripture it ſelf is Infallible*. If I therefore prove from your own Principles, that none can have an aſſent of *Faith* to this Proposition, *That whatever general Councils decree, is Infallible*, then all your Diſcourſe comes to nothing, and men can have no more certainty by their Decrees, than if they were not Infallible. And this I ſhall prove by theſe things; 1. *That you can have no certainty of Faith*
(I muſt

P. 214.

Q. 3.

(I must use your own Terms) *That the Decrees of general Councils in the general are Infallible.* 2. *That you can have no such certainty as to the Decrees of any general Council in particular.*

1. *That you cannot in the general have any certainty of Faith as to the Infallibility of general Councils.* For, 1. What Infallible Testimony have you for this, without which, you say, No certainty of Faith is to be had? It is not enough for you to say, That the Testimonies of Scripture you produce, are an Infallible Testimony for it: For that were to make the Scripture the sole Judge of this great Controversie, which you deny to be the sole Judge of any: And we must consider this as a present Controversie, which divides the Church, Whether General Councils be Infallible or no; In order to the ending which Controversie, we desire you to assign the way to it; for you tell us, you have the only Infallible Way of putting an end to Controversies. Shew us therefore, which way this must be ended in the first Place? Not by Scripture, for that were to come wholly over to us; and if it may decide this Controversie, it may as well all others. Who must then? The Pope. That cannot be, for we are not bound to believe him Infallible, but only with a General Council, as you tell us often. Must every one judge it by his Reason? No, this is the private Spirit, and would leave all to Uncertainties. What then must do it? The Pope and Council together? But that is it we are enquiring for, Whether we are to believe Pope and Council, or no: And then the Reason is, we must believe them, because they say so. And, Can any thing be more ridiculous, than for you to deny that the Scriptures are to be believed for themselves, and to assert, that the Pope and Council are to be believed for themselves? If the Pope and Council then should declare their Decrees Infallible, on what Account are we bound to believe them to be so? You have found out then an excellent Way for ending all other Controversies that are so far to seek for ending this; which you cannot possibly do, without renouncing some of your Principles, or an apparent Contradiction. But besides this, 2. Your very manner of asserting the Infallibility of General Councils, destroys all certainty of Faith concerning it. For, you say, That Councils are not Infallible, unless they be confirmed by the Pope: Which, to the Apprehension of any reasonable man, is, that they are not in and of themselves Infallible, but by virtue of the Pope's Confirmation. And therefore to say that Councils are Infallible, and then make that Infallibility depend upon the Pope's Confirmation, is meerly delusory: For, you may as well say, that the Pope and Provincial Councils are Infallible. For, Doth the Decree receive any Infallibility from the Council, or not? If it doth, then the Decree is Infallible, whether the Pope confirm it or no: If it doth not, then the Infallibility is wholly in the Pope: And he may as well make a Provincial Council Infallible, as a General. But, suppose it be some Promise which helps the Pope in a general Council, which doth not in a lesser (though there be no Reason for that, for he is Head of the Church in one as well as in the other) yet you cannot have any certainty of Faith, that the Council is Infallible. For, you say, The Pope's Confirmation is necessary to make it Infallible; but that the Pope may infallibly confirm the Council is no matter of Faith, and therefore the Infallibility of the Council can be none. For if the Council's Infallibility depend on the Pope's Confirmation, you can have no greater Certainty of the Council's Infallibility, than you have that the Pope will infallibly confirm it: But you can have no Certainty of Faith, that the Pope will infallibly confirm the Council; therefore neither can you have any of the Council's Infallibility. The

Assumption

Assumption depends upon this, that you acknowledge you can have no certainty of Faith, that the Pope is Infallible, but when he decrees in a general Council, i. e. that the Decrees by Pope and Council, are Infallible. But you can have no certainty, that the Pope in the Act of confirming them, is Infallible; for if so, you might assert it *de fide*, that the Pope without a Council, is Infallible. For his Act of Confirmation is distinct from that Infallibility which lies in the Decrees, which have passed both Pope and Council. So that if the Infallibility of Councils lies wholly in the Pope's Confirmation, and you can have no certainty of Faith of the Pope's Infallibility, you can have no certainty of Faith of the Infallibility of general Councils.

But, suppose we should grant, that you might in general be certain of the Infallibility of general Councils, when we come to instance in any one of them, you can have no certainty of Faith, as to the Infallibility of the Decrees of it. For you can have no such Certainty, that this was a lawful general Council, that it passed such Decrees, that it proceeded lawfully in passing them, and that this is the certain Meaning of them; and yet all these are necessary in order to the believing those Decrees to be Infallible, with such a Faith as you call Divine.

¶ 4.

1. You can have no certainty of Faith, that this was a lawful General Council; for that depends upon such things which you cannot say are *de fide*, as, that the Bishops in the Council, are lawful Bishops, that the Pope who confirms them is a lawful Pope; for, by your own Explication afterwards of your Doctrine, concerning the Intention of the Priest, you say, it can be but a moral certainty, and that, you contend elsewhere, can be no ground for a Divine Faith. Besides, you can have no more certainty, that is a lawful Council, whose Decrees you assent to, than you have, that those Bishops who are excluded, are Hereticks or Schismatics; but, Can you be certain of that with Divine Faith? and, Whereon is that Faith built?

2. You can have no such kind of certainty, of what Decrees were passed by them, and whether those Decrees were at all confirmed by the Pope or no? For Bellarmine confesseth, No other certainty can be had of that, than that whereby we believe there were such Persons as Cicero, or Julius Cæsar; and condemns Vega for saying, The certainty of it depends upon the definitions of the Council it self. Now this at the best, being but a humane or moral certainty, you must contradict your self, if you say, That a Divine Faith may be built upon it.

3. What Certainty can you have, that may be a ground for Faith, that the Council hath proceeded lawfully; for, in Case it doth not, your own Authors say, It may not be Infallible: For so Bellarmine answers in the Case of the Council of Chalcedon, *Concilium legitimum posse errare in his quæ non legitime agit, that a lawful Council may err, in case it doth not proceed lawfully.* Now, Who can assure one, that there have been no Practices at all used to bring off some men to give their Votes with them? It is hard to conceive such a Body of men, wherein some few do not sway and govern all the rest, and in that Case, Can any one say, that it was the Spirit of God which governed the Council? Especially if one Preside in the Council, who hath Authority and Power above all the rest, and that others in the Council have any dependence on him; Who can then expect that Freedom which is requisite to a general Council? The Councils of Ariminum and Seleucia, are condemned; because, though there were a very great number of Bishops, yet some out-witted all the rest, and, by their Subtilty, brought them to subscribe that Confession of Faith, which Pope Liberius afterwards

afterwards confirmed by his own *Subscription*. And if so great a *Council* as this, must be *reprobated* on that Account; Why not all others, where there are suspicions of the same Arts and Subtilties? Nay, How can a man be sure there have not been such Arts used in *Councils*? For it is not to be expected, that such things should be much known to the World, they being privately managed with the greatest Secrecy that may be. And yet it is in this case necessary to know, that the *Council* proceeded with all *Simplicity* and *Plainness*; for otherwise their *Determinations* may not be *Infalible*. In order to which nothing is more requisite than that there be no one, which hath any great *Authority* over them: For if the *second Council* of *Ephesus*, lawfully summoned, and the *Pope's Legates* being present, be therefore rejected, because *Dioscorus* the *Patriarch* of *Alexandria* did *over-rule* the rest; What Assurance can we have of any fair Dealing, where the *Pope* himself *presides*, who hath more Ways both to terrifie and oblige, than ever *Dioscorus* could have? Besides, set aside this *over-awing* by some potent Person, suppose some active and subtil Men perceiving how things are like to go in a *Council*, use their Wits to bring off some men, not of so deep reach as others, to their own *Party*, and it may be by the *Accession* of a small number, they *over-vote* the rest; Must we presently say, That the *Spirit of God* went off with those few men to the other *Party*? For the *Decrees* of *Councils* going by *Votes*, and those *Votes* by the *major part*; Who doth not see, how easie it is (when it stands, it may be, upon a few *Votes*) to fetch off a number to the other side. And I do not know, where the *Spirit of God* hath promised, that where *three or four men* may so much alter the *Decrees* of a *General Council*, those *Decrees*, if they pass the *major part*, shall be *infalible*, and as certain as the *Scripture*. To be sure then, there ought to be great *Confidence* of the *Simplicity* of the *Councils* Proceedings where a man must assent to them as *Infalible*; and to that end Men must be assured that they came thither without any *Prejudice* upon their minds; that when they were there, they sought nothing but the *Truth* and the *Honour* of *Christ*; or else, to be sure, *they are not gathered in his Name*, and if not so, they cannot expect *he should be in the midst of them*. Now let any one who understands the World, and humane Nature, see if he can perswade himself, that a *Council* can have no *Prejudices* or *By-ends* upon them, that nothing of *Interest* and *Reputation*, may sway upon them when they are met there, that there shall be no *Heats* or *Contentions* among them; for if there be, let him then see, Whether he can believe them to be *Infalible*? If you say, *In a matter so highly concerning the Church, the Spirit of God will not suffer them to err*? You must first shew, where the *Spirit of God* hath promised this; and then, if you could, that those Promises do not suppose the Performance of some *Conditions*, which if they neglect, they may want the effect of them. In which Case, there can be no greater Assurance of the *Spirit's Presence*, than there is of Performance of the *Conditions*, which is the thing I now aim at. Besides all which, we have known, that when it hath been a Matter of as great Concernment to the *Church*, as any of those you can fancy, great Numbers of *Bishops* at *Sirmium*, *Seleucia*, *Ariminum*, *Ephesus*, have miscarried, and decreed that which hath been judged *Herefie* by the *Church*.

4. Suppose men could be assured of the Proceedings of the *Council*, yet what certainty of *Faith* can be had of the meaning of those *Decrees*? For we see they are as liable to many Interpretations as any other Writings. If the *Scriptures* cannot put an end to Controversies on that Account, how can *General Councils* do it? When their *Decrees* are as liable to a private
Sense

Sense and wrong Interpretation as the Scriptures are: Nay much more, for we have many other Places to compare, the help of *Original Tongues*, and the *consent of the Primitive Church* to understand *Scriptures* by; when the *Decrees of Councils* are many times purposely framed in general terms, and with ambiguous Expressions to give Satisfaction to some dissenting Parties then in the Council. Who knows not, what Disputes have been raised about the Sense of some of the *Decrees of the Council of Trent*? About which the several Parties neither are, nor are like to be, agreed. Nay, Who is so unacquainted with the Proceedings of that Council, as not to understand how much care was taken in many of the *Decrees* to pass them in such general Terms, that each Party might find their Sense in them. How fearful were they of declaring themselves, for fear of disobliging a particular Party? And are these the Effects of an *Infallible Spirit*? Since we know it hath been thus in some Councils, Who dares venture his Faith, it hath not been so in others? Who dare be confident, this or that is the meaning of such a *Decree*, when it may be capable of several Senses? Was it a sign, that Council was *Infallible*, that was afraid to speak out in a case of great Consequence and Necessity in the Church? the Council of Trent, I mean, in determining, *That due Honour be given to Images*, without assigning what that *due Honour* was, which was the most needful of all to be done. If the *Decrees of Councils* were not ambiguous, what mean so many Disputes still about them as are in the World? And when at last, you say, *That the Councils are Infallible when the Pope confirms them*, you say nothing more than if we should say, *That Councils are Infallible when Scripture confirms them*. Nay, you say nothing near so much; for all are agreed, that *Scriptures are Infallible*, but many among your selves are far from believing, that the *Pope is Infallible*. And therefore we are much nearer ending Controversies, in saying, *Councils confirmed by Scripture are Infallible*, than you are in saying, *Councils confirmed by the Pope are so*.

These things being thus in the General premised, we come now to the particular handling this Controversie between his Lordship and you. And for the greater clearness of proceeding, he premises some things by way of Consideration; whereof the first is, *That all the Power an Oecumenical Council hath to determine, and all the Assistance it hath, not to err in that Determination, is all from the Universal Body of the Church, whose Representative it is. For the Government of the Church being not Monarchical, but as Christ is Head, this Principle is inviolable in Nature; Every body collective, that represents, receives Power and Privileges, from the Body which is represented, else a Representation might have force without the thing it represents; which cannot be. So, there is no power in the Council, no assistance to it, but what is in and to the Church.* But withal his Lordship adds, *That the Representative Body cannot be so free from Error as the whole Church, because in all such assemblies many able and sufficient Men being left out, they which are present may miss or misapply that Reason and Ground upon which the Determination is principally to rest. By which means the representative Body may err, whereas the represented, by virtue of those Members which saw and knew the Ground, may hold the Principle inviolated.* All the Answer which you return to this, is, *That his Supposition of the Churches not being Monarchical, is confuted already, (and I say, whatever you have produced is Answered already) and that the Power and Assistance of General Councils cannot possibly be communicated to them by the Church, but must proceed from the same Fountain now, it did in the Apostles time, viz. the direction of the Holy Ghost; this spiritual Power not being of humane, but divine Institution; and not proceeding so much from*

Q. 5.

P. 228. sect. 33.

P. 245.

Hierarch. Ec-
cles. l. 6. c. 1.

the Abilities of the Persons, as from the Co-operation of the Holy Spirit with them. To which I reply, that all this had need be more than thus barely asserted: it being confessed by your selves (as his Lordship shews) that a General Council is a Representative of the whole Church, you ought to have shewed us the Divine Institution of this Representative, and the Promises made to it under that Notion, or else we may still say with his Lordship, That all the Power and Assistance it hath, is by virtue of that Body which it represents. But I need not in this urge the Arguments of Protestants against you; for in this, as in most other Controversies, we have enough from those of your own Party to oppose against these Affirmations of yours. For Albertus Pighius not only asserts, but proves, that General Councils are not of divine, but humane Institution, arising from a Dictate of right Reason; that matters of doubt may be better debated by many prudent and experienced Persons than by a few. So that as the supream Authority for Administration of Affairs belongs to one, so it is most agreeable to right Reason, that Debates should be by many. This he proves at large, that nothing but human Reason is the Foundation of Councils in the Church; for, saith he, *In Scripturis Canonici nullum de iis verbum est; nec ex Apostolorum institutione, speciale quicquam de illis accepit illa primitiva Christi Ecclesia.* There is not a word of them in Scripture, neither did the primitive Church receive any particular Order from the Apostles concerning them: which he from thence proves, because in all the time of the Primitive Church till the Nicene Council, there is no mention at all of them. And at that time it did not receive any new Revelation concerning the celebrating General Councils, but the Emperor Constantine's Zeal for the Peace of the Church was the first Cause and Original of them. From whence he concludes, that they have no supernatural or divine Institution, sed prorsus humanam, but altogether humane: for they are, saith he, *The Invention of Constantine sometimes useful, but not at all necessary.* This Man speaks intelligibly, and not like those who jumble Pope and Council together to make something Infallible between them. For he says, *It is the better way by far to go immediately to the Apostolical See and consult that, as the Infallible Oracle, in all Doubts of Faith.* And very honestly tells us, *That he believes Constantine was ignorant of that Privilege of the Holy See, when he first instituted General Councils.* Than which nothing could be spoken truer. If you have then nothing more to say for the Divine Institution of General Councils, than what you have acquainted us with, it would be much more Wisdom in you to contend with Pighius for the Pope's Infallibility, and let that of General Councils shift for it self.

p. 6.

P. 230.

Ibid.

His Lordship's second Consideration you admit of, viz. *That though the Act which is hammered out by many together, must needs be perfecter, than that which is but the Child of one Man's Sufficiency; yet this cannot be Infallible, unless it be from some special Assistance of the Holy Ghost.* Therefore omitting your very impertinent Addition to this Consideration, viz. *So as to make its Decrees Infallible,* (which is the thing in Question): We proceed to the third; which is, *That the Assistance of the Holy Ghost is without Error, which (saith he) is no Question; and as little that a Council hath it.* But the doubt that troubles, is, *whether all Assistance of the Holy Ghost be afforded in such a high manner, as to cause all the Definitions of a Council in Matters fundamental in the Faith, and in remote Deductions from it, to be alike Infallible.* From this last Expression you would very Subtily infer contrary to his Lordship's Design, *That he granted General Councils to be Infallible in Deductions, as well as Fundamentals, but not to be alike Infallible;* whereas it is plain, his Lordship means no more by *alike Infallible,* than, *Whether the Assistance*

Assistance be *alike* in both to make them *infallible*. And this you might easily perceive, but it would have prevented your Cavil about a *graduated infallibility*; which I know none assert but your self. This Consideration brings on the main of the Battle, in those *Texts of Scripture*, which are most insisted on to prove the *Infallibility of General Councils*, viz. *John 16. 13. I will send you the Spirit of Truth, and he shall lead you into all Truth.* *Joh 14. 16. This Spirit shall abide with you for ever.* *Matth. 28. 20. Behold I am with you to the end of the World.* *Matth. 16. 18. The founding of the Church upon the Rock against which the Gates of Hell shall not prevail.* *Luke 22. 32. Christ's Prayer for St. Peter, that his Faith should not fail.* *Matth. 18. 20. Where two or three are gathered together in my Name, I will be in the midst of them.* *Acts 15. 28. It seemed good to the Holy Ghost, and to us.* All which Places (except the two last) have been already examined as far as concerns any Promise of *Infallibility* in the Questions concerning the *Church's* and the *Pope's Infallibility*: and there being no Reason at all given, why any *Infallibility* at all is promised by them to the *Church* after the *Apostle's* times, it may seem wholly needless to bestow a particular Consideration again upon all of them. For it is evident in those Places, all your drift and design, is only to prove a Promise of *Infallibility* in the *Church*, and to the *Councils* only by virtue of that. But having at large before shewed, that no such thing can be inferred from these or any other Places, that which is built upon it, is wholly taken away too. For the only Pretence that you have, why *Councils* should be proved hence *Infallible*, is, because the *Church* hath *Infallibility* promised by these *Texts*, which must be very well proved, and much better than you have done, either here, or elsewhere, before the other can be deduced from hence. And yet supposing I should grant, that *Infallibility* was promised to the *Church*, I see no such necessary Consequence from thence, that *General Councils* must be *Infallible*: unless you can prove from *Scripture*, that the *Infallibility* of the *Church* is meant of the *Church representative* and not *diffusive*; which is a new Task which you have not yet undertaken. For it is not enough to say, *That the Body of the Church is bound to believe and profess the Doctrine taught by the Representative, and therefore the Representative must be Infallible*, unless you could first prove, that there is a necessity of some continued *Infallible* teaching by the *Church Representative*: which I despair of ever seeing done. I am so far therefore from thinking as you do, *That these Texts are sufficiently clear in themselves to prove the Infallibility of General Councils*, that I believe a *Philosopher* might hear them repeated a hundred times over, without ever imagining any such thing as a *General Council*, much less concluding thence, that they are *Infallible*. But because you again cavil with another Expression of his Lordships, in that he saith, *That no one of them doth infer, much less enforce Infallibility*; from whence you not infer but enforce this Consequence, *that he was loth to say all of them together did not*; I shall therefore give you his Lordship's Answer from all of them together. Which is likewise sufficient for every one of them. And for all the Places together, saith he, weigh them with Indifference, and either they speak of the *Church* (including the *Apostles*) as all of them do; and then all grant the *Voice of the Church is God's Voice Divine and Infallible*. Or else they are general, unlimited, and applicable to private Assemblies as well as *General Councils*, which none grant to be *Infallible*, but some mad *Enthusiasts*. Or else they are limited, not simply to all Truth, but all necessary to *Salvation*; in which I shall easily grant a *General Council* cannot err suffering it self to be led by this *Spirit of Truth* in *Scripture*, and not taking upon it to lead

P. 254.

P. 246.

P. 232

lead both the Scripture and the Spirit. For, suppose these Places or any other did promise Assistance even to Infallibility, yet they granted it not to every General Council, but to the Catholick body of the Church it self; and if it be in the whole Church principally, then is it in a General Council but by consequent, as the Council represents the whole. And that which belongs to a thing by consequent, doth not otherwise, nor longer, belong unto it, than it consents and cleaves to that, upon which it is a consequent. And therefore a General Council hath not this Assistance, but as it keeps to the whole Church and Spouse of Christ, whose it is to hear his Word and determine by it. And therefore if a General Council will go out of the Churches way, it may easily go without the Churches Truth. Which Words of his, contain so full an Answer to all these Places together, that till that be taken off, there is no Necessity at all to descend to the particular Places, especially those which are acknowledged by your selves to speak primarily of the Churches Infallibility.

§. 7. Yet for your Satisfaction (more than any *intelligent Readers*) I shall add somewhat further, to shew the Impertinency of the former Places, and then consider the force of the two last, which have not yet been handled.

1. *There can be nothing drawn from Promises made to the diffusive Body, for the benefit of the Representative, unless the Maker of those Promises did institute that Representation.* Therefore, supposing that Infallibility were by these Promises bestowed upon the Catholick Church, yet you cannot thence infer, that it belongs to a General Council, unless you prove that Christ did appoint a General Council to represent the Church, and in that Representation to be Infallible. For this Infallibility coming meerly by Promise, it belongs only to those to whom the Promise is made, and in that Capacity in which it is made to it. For, *Spiritual Gifts* are not bequeathable to Heirs, nor can be made over to Assigns; if the Church be promised Infallibility, she cannot pass away the Gift of it to her Assigns in a General Council, unless that Power of Devolution be contained in the Original Grant. For she can give no more than is in her Power to bestow; but this Infallibility being out of her disposal, the utmost that can be given to a General Council is a power to oblige the Church by the Acts of it, which falls much short of Infallibility. Besides, this Representation of the Church by a General Council, is a thing not so evident from whence it should come, that from a Promise made to one it must necessarily be understood of the other. For, as *Pighius* says, *It cannot be demonstrated from Theological Grounds, that a General Council which is so far from being the whole Church, that it is not a thousandth part of it, should represent the whole Church.* For either, saith he, it hath this from Christ or from the Church; but they cannot produce one Tittle from Scripture, where Christ hath conveyed over the Power and Authority of the whole Church to a hundred or two hundred Bishops. If they say, *It is from the Church;* there are two things to be shewed, first, that it is done; and secondly, that it is de jure or ought to be so done. First, it can never be shewed, that such a thing ever was done by the Universal Church; for if it were, it must either be by some formal Act of the Church or by a tacit consent. It could not be by any formal Act of the Church; For then there must be some such Act of the Universal Church, preceding the being of any General Council; for by that Act they receive their Commission to appear in behalf of the Universal Church. And this could not be done in a General Council, because that is not pretended to be the whole Church, but only to represent it; and therefore it must have this Power to represent the Church by something antecedent to its Being. Else it would only arrogate this Power to it self without any Act of the Church in order to it. Now that the Universal Church did

Hierarch. Eccl.
1. 6. c. 4.

did ever agree in any such act, is utterly impossible to be demonstrated, either that it could be, or that it was. Yet such a *Delegation* to a *General Council* must be supposed in order to its *Representation* of the whole *Church*; and this *delegation* must not only be before the first *General Council*, but, for all that I can see, before every one. For how can the *Church* by its act in one Age bind the *Church* in all Ages succeeding to the *Acts* of those several *Councils* which shall be chosen afterwards? If it be said, *That such a formal Act is not necessary, but the tacit consent of the whole Church is sufficient for it*: then such a Consent of the *Church* must be made evident, by which, they did devolve over the Power of the whole *Church* to such a *Representative*. And all those must consent in that Act whose Power the *Council* pretends to have, and so it cannot be sufficient to say, *That those who choose Bishops for the Council do it*; for then they could only represent those who chose them, and so their Authority will fall much short of that of the whole *Church*. But suppose such a thing were done by the whole *Church*, of which no Footsteps at all appear, we must further enquire by what *Right* or *Authority* this is done, for the Authority of the *Church* being given it by *Christ*, it cannot be given from it self without his *Commission* for doing it. Which if we stay till it can be produced in this case, we may stay long enough before we see any such *Infallible Representative* of the *Universal Church*. The utmost then, that can be supposed in this case, is, that the Parts of the *Church* may voluntarily consent to accept of the *Decrees* of such a *Council*; and by that voluntary Act, or by the *Supreme Authority* injoining it, such *Decrees* may become Obligatory. But what is this to an *Infallibility* in the *Council*, because it represents the whole *Church*? For neither is there Evidence enough for such a *Representation*, neither, if there were, could any Privilege of that Nature belong to the *Representative Body*, because of any Promise made to the *diffusive Body* of the *Church*.

2. *What belongs to the Representative Body of the Church by virtue of a Promise made to the diffusive, can in no other Sense be understood of the Representative, than as it belongs to the Diffusive.* Because no further Right can be derived from any than they had themselves. Therefore supposing a Promise of *Infallibility* made to the *Church*, it is necessary to know in what way and manner that *Promise* belongs to it; for in no other way and manner can it belong to the *Council* which represents it. If therefore the *Churches Infallibility* lies only in *Fundamentals*, the *Councils Infallibility* can extend no further. If the *Churches Infallibility* doth not imply, that all the *Church* or the *major Part* should be *Infallible*, but that though the *major Part* err, yet all the *Church* shall not, then neither can it be true of a *General Council*, that all, or the *major Part* should be *Infallible*, but only that there should be no such *General Council*, wherein all the *Bishops* should err. But then this is utterly destructive to the *Infallibility* of the *Decrees* of *General Councils*, for those must pass by the *major Part* of the *Votes*: Which *Canus*, one of the acutest of our Adversaries, was sensible of, and grants, *that the major Part in a General Council may err, and the lesser Part hold the Truth; but then, he saith, That the Pope is not bound to follow the major Part.* Which is expressly to take away any pretext of *Infallibility* from the *Decrees* of the *Council*, and place it wholly in the *Pope*: And, Why may not then the *Pope* and a *Provincial Council* be as *Infallible*, as the *Pope* and the *lesser Part* of a *General Council*? What then do the *Promises* of *Infallibility* to the *Council* signifie, if the *major Part* may definitively err? And therefore *Bellarmino* likes not this Answer, as being too plain and open, but gives another as destructive to the *Council's Infallibility*, as this is.

Which

§. 3.

*Canus loc.
Theol. l. 5. c. 5.*

*Bellarmin. de
Concil. l. 2. c. 9.*

Which is, *that in case the major Part doth resist the better in a General Council, as in that of Ariminum, and the second at Ephesus, yet that it cannot conquer it.* How so? Doth it not conquer it when the Decrees are passed by the major Part? No, saith he, *for these Decrees are afterwards made void.* Very good: But then, I suppose in the Council, the major Part did conquer, although not after. But by whom are they made void? *By him to whom it belongs to confirm his Brethren,* saith Bellarmine. Well, but the Skill is, to know who that is in this case, who can reverse the Decree of the Representative Body of the Church under the Plea of *confirming his Brethren*? If it be the Pope, Who reversed the Decrees of the Council of Sirmium, to which the Pope subscribed? And for that of Ariminum and Seleucia, Hilary did more to reverse it, than ever the Pope did. Therefore others say, It is in the Churches Power to make void the Decrees of General Councils, as she did the Decrees of the Arrian Councils. If so, then we plainly see, the Infallibility doth not lie in the representative, but in the diffusive Body of the Church still; if that hath the Power to avoid and repeal the Decrees of General Councils. So that all the Infallibility of Councils is merely probationary, and stands to the good-liking and consent of the diffusive Body of the Church. By which means the Decrees of a Provincial Council being accepted by the Church, are as Infallible as of a General. But in all these ways, there is no proper Infallibility at all in the major Part of a General Council, but it wholly lies either in the Pope, or in the diffusive Body of the Church still.

3. *If these Places which mention a Promise of Infallibility to the Church, must imply the Infallibility of General Councils, as the Churches Representative, then it will thence follow, that the Decrees of General Councils are Infallible, whether the Pope confirm them or no.* For the Infallibility is not promised at all *mediate Papâ*, but *virtute Ecclesiæ*; for if they be Infallible as representing the Church, they are Infallible, whether there be any Pope or no: for the Pope doth not make them more represent the Church than they did before. And this is very well understood and proved by those, who from these Promises to the Church, and from that Infallibility consequent upon it (by their Adversaries Confession) to a General Council, do infer the Councils Authority to be above the Pope's. Which is a just and necessary Consequence from this Assertion, That the Privileges of the Universal Church, are by vertue of its Representation in a General Council. Which Doctrine was asserted by the Councils of Constance, and Basil, and by the Sorbonne Doctors, till their being Jesuited of late. Who have therefore asserted, that it might be as lawful to call in question the Decrees of the Council of Trent, as of those two Councils. And whereas their Adversaries object, That this is not *de fide*; they answer, It is impossible but that it should be *de fide*, since it is decreed by General Councils. For, say they, were the Fathers at Constance and Basil, acted by any other Spirit, than those at Nicaea, and Ephesus? Why may not then the Council of Trent be opposed as well as them? For if there be any Difference, they had much the Advantage. In the Council of Constance (say they) two Popes were present, all the Cardinals, two Patriarchs of Constantinople, and Antioch, and the Emperor himself, and the Legates of all Christian Princes; and besides all this, it was confirmed by Pope Martin, and the Acts of Confirmation extant in the 45th Session. And to the Council of Basil was begun, according to the Decrees of the Councils of Constance and Pisa, and by vertue of the Bulls of Martin and Eugenius; and the Popes Legates were Presidents in it. So that if General Councils be Infallible, it must be *de fide Catholicâ*, that their Authority is above the Pope's:

And

And if so, their Infallibility cannot depend upon his Confirmation. Now, if we search into the Grounds on which they build this Power of General Councils independently on the Pope, we shall find they derive it wholly from those Places of Scripture, which speak so much concerning the Church and Councils, as is agreed on both sides. And therefore *Aeneas Sylvius* (afterwards *Pius 2.*) says, *That is not the less de fide, because it is contradicted by some, since it is founded on the Promises of Christ concerning the Church.* Since therefore the Pope himself is but *Filius Ecclesiae*, and the Church is *Sponsa Christi*; they say, It is unreasonable that the Son of the Church should not be subject to the Spouse of Christ. If therefore these Promises concerning the Church, infer an Infallibility in it, and that Infallibility be in a General Council, as representing the Church; it follows thence, that Councils must be in themselves Infallible, whether confirmed by the Pope or no. And we may see, how little this Opinion of Infallibility of General Councils is like to stand between them, by the Answers which are given by those of the other Party, who make the Pope's Confirmation necessary to the Infallibility of the Council. For *Canus* expressly saith, *That the Council is said to be Infallible in no other Sense than the Church is, i. e. in those Things wherein all agreed, and not the major Part.* *Bellarmin* likes not this; For, saith he, if the major Part of the Council err, the Council must of necessity err: for that which properly belongs to the Council, is, Passing Judgment in matter of Faith, or making Decrees: now, if that were not the lawful Decree of the Council, which is made by the major Part, there never could be a lawful Decree, for none passes without some dissenting: and therefore he denies that the Council doth fully represent the Church without the Pope. So that on both sides we see, how pregnant these Proofs are for the Council's Infallibility, when one saith, That if they be understood of the Church, the Councils Infallibility doth not want the Pope's Confirmation, the other to make the Pope's Confirmation necessary, denies such an absolute Representation of the Church in the Council. If then the Council doth represent the Church, it is Infallible, although not confirmed by the Pope, if it doth not, then the Promises made to the Church cannot belong to the General Council. Thus I have shewed you, how far these Places concerning (as you say) the Infallibility of the Church, are, from proving the Infallibility of General Councils.

But, though these general Places concerning the Church, may not so clearly prove the Infallibility of General Councils, yet, you say, *There are some particular Places to this purpose.* Which are, *Mat. 18. 20. and Act. 15. 28.* Which not having been handled already, I must follow you more closely in the Examination of them. The first place is, *Mat. 18. 20. Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them.* The Substance of the Argument from this Place, his Lordship thus repeats from *Bellarmin*. *The strength of the Argument is not taken from these Words alone, but as they are continued with the former, and that the Argument is drawn à minori ad majus, from the less to the greater, thus. If two or three gathered in my Name do always obtain that which they ask at God's hands, viz. Wisdom and Knowledge of those things which are necessary for them: How much more shall all the Bishops gathered together in Council, always obtain Wisdom and Knowledge, to judge those Things, which belong to the Direction of the whole Church: To which his Lordship answers, That there is very little Strength in these Words, either considered alone, being generally interpreted by the Fathers, of consent in Prayer, or with the Argument à minori ad majus, 1. Because, though that Argument hold in natural or necessary Things, yet not in voluntary or promised Things, or Things which depend upon their Institution. 2. Because it follows not, but where, and so far*

*Aeneas Sylv.
de gest. Concil.
Basil. l. 1.*

*De Concil. l. 2.
c. 11.*

¶ 9.

P. 234.

P. 251, 252.

as, the thing upon which the Argument is founded, agrees to the less: Now this Infallibility doth not belong to the lesser Congregation, and therefore cannot be inferred as to the greater. 3. Because it depends upon Conditions here supposed of being gathered together in the name of Christ, and therefore supposing Infallibility promised, these Conditions here implied must be known before such a Congregation can be known to be Infallible. 4. Because Christ's promise of Presence in the midst of them, is only to grant, what he shall find to be fit for them, not infallibly whatsoever they shall think fit to ask for themselves. 5. Because Gregory de Valentia and Stapleton confess, that this Place doth not properly belong to prove an infallible certainty of any Sentence in which more agree in the name of Christ, but to the efficacy of consent for obtaining that which more shall pray for in the name of Christ, if at least that be for their Souls health. For else it would hence follow, that not only the definition of a general Council, but even of a Provincial; nay, of two or three Bishops gathered together, is valid, and that without the Pope's consent. The utmost I can make of your Reply to these Answers, lies in this, That you grant that primarily and directly our Saviour doth not intend that particular Infallibility: and this is that which Gregory and Stapleton assert; but only that he signified in general, that he would be present with his Church, and all faithful People gathered together in his name, so often, and so far, as their necessities required his presence, they duly imploring it. But yet the Argument holds for the Infallibility of general Councils, and not National or Provincial, because the necessities of the Church require one, and not the other: and that it will follow a minori ad majus; in things promised, as well as natural, where the motive is increased, and neither goodness nor power wanting in the promiser. But all this depends on a false Supposition, viz. that there is a necessity of Infallibility to continue in the Church, and that all Persons are bound to believe the Decrees of the Councils to be the Infallible Oracles of Truth; but we say, neither of these are necessary in the Church, and therefore you have no ground to extend this Promise of Christ's Presence to the Infallibility of Councils. For you are not to extend the Power and Goodness of Christ as far as you shall judge fitting, but as far only as he hath promised to extend it. For otherwise it would be far more for the Peace and Unity of the Church, if every particular Congregation had this Infallibility, than if only General Councils had it: Because by that means, many disputes about the Authority, Calling, and Proceedings of General Councils would be prevented: Nay, it might be extended much further, for by this Argument from the Goodness and Power of Christ, you might, for all that I can see, infer with more force, that every true Christian should be Infallible, and so there be no need of any Councils at all. For, whatever Argument you can produce, why Christ's Goodness should extend to make Councils Infallible, it will much more hold as to the other; for the Peace, and Unity of the Church would be far better secured this way. If you say that Experience shews, Christ never intended this by the Errors of particular Men in all Ages; To the same Purpose we answer you as to Councils, that large Experience shews, that when Bishops have solemnly met in Council, they have been grossly deceived; as you confess in all the Arian Councils. If your Argument would have ever held from the Power and Goodness of Christ; Would it not have held at that time, when so great a matter of Faith was under debate? If Christ therefore suffered so many Bishops so grossly to err, in a matter of such Importance, wherein the Church was so highly concerned, How can you infer from his power and goodness, that he will never suffer general Councils to err? If you answer, That these erred for not observing the Conditions requisite in order to Christ's hearing them, viz. that they were not met in the name of Christ, did

did not come without Prejudice, nor rely on Divine Assistance. I pray take the same Answer as to all other Councils, that we cannot know that *Christ* heals them, or that they are Infallible, till we are assured of their Performance of the *Conditions* requisite in order to that *Infallibility*. And when you can assure us, that such a Council met together in the Name of *Christ*, and came merely with a desire to find out *Truth*, and relied wholly on his Assistance for it, we do not so much distrust the *Power* and *Goodness* of *Christ*, as to think he will suffer them to be deceived. For we know upon those *Conditions* he will not suffer any good Man to err, much less an *Assembly* of them met in a *General Council*. But here you have the hardest Task of all lying upon you, which is, to prove that a *General Council* hath observed all these *Conditions*, without which nothing can be inferred from this Place, as to *Christ's* being in any Sense in the midst of them.

The last place mentioned for the Infallibility of *General Councils*, is that, *Act. 15. 28.* *Where the Apostles say of themselves, and the Council held by them; It seems good to the Holy Ghost, and to us. And, saith his Lordship, they might well say it. For they had infallibly the Assistance of the Holy Ghost, and kept close to his Direction. But there is a great deal of difference between them and succeeding Councils, who never arrogated this to their Definitions, though they presumed of the Assistance of the Holy Ghost; and though that Form might be used, yet they did not assume such an Infallibility to themselves, as the Apostles had. And therefore it is little less than Blasphemy in Stapleton, to say, That the Decrees of Councils are the very Oracles of the Holy Ghost. And, that all Councils are not so Infallible, as was this of the Apostles, nor the Causes handled in them, as there they were, is manifest by the ingenuous confession of Ferus to that purpose.* This is the Substance of his Lordship's Answer to this Place. Which you think to take off by saying, *That there's no essential difference between the certainty of the things determined by the Apostles, and those decided by a General Council, confirmed by the Roman Bishop: and though after Councils use not the same Expression in Terms, yet they do it in effect, by enjoining the Belief of their Decisions under the Pain of Anathema.* If this be the meaning of the *Anathema's* of Councils, there had need indeed be no great difference between the *Apostles* Decrees, and theirs. But this had need be very well proved; and so it is by you; for you produce several Expressions of *Cyril*, *Athanasius*, *Austin*, *Leo*, *Gregory*, and some others (out of *Bellarmin*) in which they magnifie the Decrees of *General Councils*, calling them a *Divine Oracle*, a *Sentence inspired by the Holy Ghost*, not to be retracted, and some others to the same purpose, by which you vindicate *Stapleton*, and tell us, he said no more than the *Fathers* had done before him. Yet all this is far from any Vindication of *Stapleton*, or proving your Assertion as to the equal Certainty of the Decrees of Councils, and of the *Apostles*. For the ground of all those Expressions, and several others of the same Nature, was not the Supposition of any inherent Infallibility in the Decrees of *General Councils*, but their great Assurance of the Truth of that *Doctrine*, which was determined by those first *General Councils*. For although I am far enough from believing the *Council of Trent* Infallible, yet if that had determined the same Points of Faith, which were determined in the first four *General Councils*, and nothing else; I might have said, *That the Decrees of that Council was a Holy and Divine Oracle, a Sentence inspired by the Holy Ghost, &c.* not that I thought the Council in the least Infallible, in determining these Things; but that they were of themselves *Divine Truths*, which the Council determined. And in this Sense *Athanasius* might well term the Definition of the *Nicene Council* against *Arius*, the Word of our Lord which endureth for ever; and *Constantine*

p. 10.

P. 237.

P. 253.

stile it a *cælestial mandate*; and Gregory might reverence the four Councils, as the four Gospels (though Bellarmin tells you, that Expression must be taken in a qualified Sense) yet all these, and any other of a like Nature, I say, import no more than that they were fully assured, the matters decreed by them, were revealed by God in his Word, and not that they believed that they became such holy and divine Oracles, meerly by the Council's Definition. For the contrary might be abundantly manifested by many Expressions in them quite to another purpose: and if, instead of all the rest, you will but read *Athanasius* and *Hilary* concerning Councils, you will find your self strangely deceived, if you believe they ever thought them

P. 254.

Infallible. What you add afterwards, *that it is sufficient that there be a real Infallibility, though not like to that of the Apostles*, will not be sufficient for me, till you can shew me the Degrees of *Infallibility*; for, I will promise you, if you can once prove that Councils are really *Infallible*, I shall not stick to say, That they are *alike Infallible* with the *Apostles*. As for your discarding *Ferus* as a *prohibited Author*, it only shews the great Integrity of the Man, who spoke too much Truth to be born by the tender Ears of the Roman Inquisition.

P. 249.

Before I had proceeded any further, I had thought (because of a former Promise) to have looked back to the place, where you speak in Vindication of the *decretal Epistles*; but because you only refer to *Turrianus* his Defence of them, I shall only return you an equal Courtesie, and refer you to the abundantly sufficient Answer to him by *David Blondel*. One would have thought you should have been ashamed of so notorious an Imposture as those *decretal Epistles* are; but we see, what Shifts a bad Cause puts you upon, that such Men as *Ferus*, *Cassander*, *Erasmus*, are under an *Index Expurgatorius*, but the *decretal Epistles* must be still justified; but he that doth not see the Reasons of these Proceedings, wants a greater *Index Expurgatorius* for his Brains, than ever they did for their Books.

P. 11.

We return therefore to our present Subject, and having manifested, how far the Infallibility of General Councils is from being grounded on the Veracity of divine Promises, as you pretend without Ground; we now proceed to the Consent of the Church, as to this Subject; which his Lordship speaks to in the next Consideration. Which is, *That all agree that the Church in general can never err from the Faith necessary to Salvation; but there is not the like consent that General Councils cannot err*. Whether *Waldensis* asserting, that General Councils may err, speak of such Councils as are accounted unlawful or no, is not much material; since, as his Lordship says, *The Fathers having to do with so many Hereticks, and so many of them opposing Church Authority, did never in the Condemnation of those Hereticks utter this Proposition, That a General Council cannot err. And supposing that no General Council had erred in any matter of Moment to this Day, which will not be found true, yet this would not have followed, that it is therefore Infallible and cannot err*. And to shew that *St. Augustin* puts a manifest difference between the Rules of Scripture and the Definitions of Men, he produceth that noted Place in him, wherein he so fully asserts the Prerogative of Scripture above all the Writings of Men, or Definitions of Councils: Which, because it will be often refer'd to, I have

P. 240.

Quis autem nesciat sanctam Scripturam canonice tam veteris quam novi Testamenti certis suis terminis contineri, eamque omnibus posterioribus Episcoporum literis ita proponi, ut de illa omnino dubitari & disceptari non possit, utrum verum, vel utrum rectum sit, quicquid in ea scriptum esse constiterit? Episcoporum autem literas quæ post confre-

cited at large in the Margin, but his Lordship gives the sum of it in these Words. *That whatsoever is found written in Scripture, may neither be doubted nor disputed, whether it be true or right. But the Letters of Bishops may not only be disputed, but corrected by Bishops that are more learned and wise than they, or by National Councils; and*

National

*National Councils, by Plenary or General. And even Plenary Councils themselves may be amended, the former by the latter. From whence he inferrs, That it seems it was no news with St. Austin, that a general Council might err, and therefore be inferiour to the Scripture, which may neither be doubted nor disputed, where it affirms. And if it be so with the definition of a Council too, where is then the Scriptures Prerogative? But his Lordship adds, That there is much shifting about this Place, but it cannot be wrestled off. And therefore undertakes punctually to answer all the evasions of Stapleton and Bellarmine, who have taken most Pains about it. But before you come to particular Answers, you are resolved to make your way through them, by a more desperate Attempt: which is, to prove that it cannot be St. Austin's Meaning in this Place, that general Councils may err in their Definitions of Faith, because then S. Austin must contradict himself, because he delivers the contrary in other Places. This is indeed to the Purpose, if you go through with your Undertaking; but we must examine the Places: The first is *l. 1. c. 7. de Baptism. c. Donatist.* where you say, he expressly teacheth, *That no doubt ought to be made of what is by full Decree established in a general Council.* But here a great doubt may justly be made, Whether ever you searched this Place or no; for if you had, you would have had little Heart to produce it to this Purpose. For St. Augustin is there giving an Account, why he would not insist upon any humane Authorities, but bring certain Evidence out of Scripture for what he said; and the Reason he gives for it, is, because in the former times of the Church before the Schism of Donatus brake forth, the Bishops and particular Councils did differ from each other about the Question in hand, viz. *Rebaptizing Hereticks*, until that by a General Council of the whole World, that which was most soundly held *etiam remotis dubitationibus firmaretur*, was confirmed the Disputes being taken away. The utmost that can be drawn hence, is, that when this Controversie was decided by a General Council, the Disputes were ended among the Catholick Bishops. But by what Arts can you hence draw, that S. Austin thought the Council Infallible in its Definitions? When the Business came to be argued in a free Council by the dissenting Parties, and they more fully understood each other, and agreed upon one Sentence, S. Austin says the former Doubts were taken off: that is, the Reasons and Scriptures produced on the other side satisfied them: but he doth not say, that no doubt is to be made of what is by full Decree established in a general Council; but, that no Doubts were made after it. But if you say, *There could be no Agreement unless the Councils definition were supposed Infallible*, you speak that which is contrary to the Sense and Experience of the World; and even of that general Council where this Decree is supposed by Bellarmine to be made, viz. *the Council of Nice.* For, Will you say the Council was Infallible in deciding the time of keeping Easter, because after that Council the Asian Bishops submitted to the Custom of other Churches? Is there no way imaginable to convince men, but by Infallibility? If there be, their Doubts may be taken away by a general Council, and yet that Council not be supposed Infallible. For if S. Augustin had meant so, nothing had been more pertinent than to have insisted on the Decree of that Council; and yet he there leaves it, and calls all Arguments of that nature humane Arguments, and therefore saith, *ex Evangelio profero certa documenta; I bring certain Evidences out of the Gospel.* Which Words doubtless he would never have*

matum Canonem vel scripta sunt vel scribuntur, & per sermonem forte sapientiorum, cuiuslibet in ea re peritioris, & per aliorum Episcoporum graviorum auctoritatem, doctrinarumque prudentiam, & per Concilia licere reprehendi, si quid in eis forte à veritate deviatum est. Et ipsa Concilia quæ per singulas regiones vel provincias sunt plenariorum Conciliorum auctoritati, quæ sunt ex universo orbe Christiano, sine ullis ambagibus cedere, ipsaque plenaria sæpe priora posterioribus emendari, cum aliquo experimento rerum aperitur quod clausum erat, & cognoscitur quod latebat, sine ullo typho sacrilegæ superbiam, sine ullâ inflatâ cervicis arrogantiam, sine ullâ contentione lividâ, invidia, cum sanctâ humilitate, cum pace Catholicâ, cum charitate Christianâ, Aug. l. 2. de bapt. c. Donatist. c. 3.

have so immediately subjoyned to his former concerning a *general Council*, if he had judged it *Infallible*, or its decrees as certain as the *Scriptures*. In your second place *L. 5. c. 7.* there is nothing hath any Shadow of Pertinency to your Purpose; that which I suppose you may mean, is, *L. 5. c. 17.* where what he said before *was decreed by a General Council*, he after saith, *was the Judgment of the Holy Catholick Church*: From whence you may indeed infer that the *Catholick Church* did approve that *decree* of the *Council*, but how it proves it *Infallible* I cannot understand. Your last Place is one sufficiently known to be far enough from your Purpose, *Ep. 118. ad Januar.* where he saith, *In case of indifferent Rites, it is insolent madness to oppose the whole Church*; but you are an excellent Disputant, who can hence infer, that therefore *General Councils* are *Infallible in their Definitions in Matters of Faith*. For any thing then you have brought to the contrary *St. Austin* is far enough from the least danger of contradicting himself. But if you could prove that he were of your mind, that the *Definitions of Councils* are *Infallible* as well as the *Scriptures*, never did any man more expressly contradict himself than *S. Augustin* must do in a multitude of plain Places, wherein he saith, *That no other Writing is Infallible but the Scripture*; *That only according to them he judged freely of all other Writings*; and that *because he could yield an undoubted assent to none but them*. That there is no other *Writing* wherein humane *Infirmities* are not discovered but in them; that *men are at liberty to believe or not believe any thing besides the Scripture*. Can any man, who says these things, be reasonably supposed to assert that the *Decrees of General Councils* are as certain as the *Scripture* is? You see then what little advantage you have gained by this Attempt of offering to make *St. Austin* contradict himself, if in this place he should be supposed to assert that *General Councils* may err: which he doth plainly enough to any but those who are resolved not to understand him.

Aug. ep. 19. ad Hieronymum c. Crescon. Grammat. l. 2. c. 31. De Nat. & Gratia c. 61. c. Faustum, l. 11. c. 5. Epistol. 112.

Q. 12.
P. 256.

P. 241.

This Prejudice being therefore removed, we come to the particular Evasions of this Place; which you thus sum up, in order to the defence of them. *That when he saith, Former General Councils may be amended by the latter, it is only to be understood in Matters of Fact, in Precepts pertaining to Manners and Discipline, or by way of more full and clear Explication of what had been delivered by former Councils.* To both these, his Lordship offers very just Exceptions. To the first, that it is to be understood of *Precepts of Manners and Discipline*; he saith, 1. *That Bellarmine contradicts himself, because he had said before, that General Councils cannot err in Precepts of Manners: No, (say you) this is no contradiction, because these depend much upon Circumstances of Time, Place, Person, &c. which varying, it often so falls out, that what at first was prudently judged fit to be done, becomes afterwards unfitting, and in this case one General Council may be amended by another, and yet neither charged with Error.* But do you suppose the mean while that *St. Austin* spake pertinently to this Business, or no? If he did, he can be understood only of such a *Precept* as that relating to the *Baptism of Hereticks*. Suppose then one *Council* should decree *Hereticks to be baptized*, and another afterwards correct this, and say, *They should not*, Will you say that neither of these were in an Error? So that your Answer is wholly impertinent to the Scope of *St. Austin's* Discourse. And so his Lordship saith, *This whole Answer is concerning Precepts of Manners*: for *St. Austin* disputes against the Error of *St. Cyprian* followed by the *Donatists*, which was an Error in Faith; namely, that true *Baptism* could not be given by *Hereticks* and such as were out of the Church. But you say, *St. Austin* doth not confine his Discourse to *St. Cyprian's* Case only, but by occasion of his, and his Councils Error, he lays down general Doctrine, touching the different Authority of the Writings of particular Bishops, Provincial,

P. 257.

Provincial, National, and General Councils. Although I should grant you this, it will make little for your Purpose; for St. *Austin's* main Design is, to set the *Authority of Scripture* far above all these, and that in point of *Certainty and Infallibility*; and this being his main *Scope*, whatsoever he says of any of these, it is certain his Purpose is to shew that all of them fall short of the *Sacred Scripture*, as to our yielding assent to them. For these in the first place are set by themselves, as only being *Infallible* and deserving an *undoubted Assent* to all that is contained in them; which being supposed, he proceeds to shew what the Extent is of all other *Authority* besides this. For the *Writings of Bishops* saith he, *they are so far from deserving such an assent as we give to the Scriptures, that they may be corrected by others, or by National Councils; and National Councils, by Plenary; and Plenary may be amended, the former by the latter.* In all which Gradations two things must be repeated *et iterum* as running through the whole Discourse, which are, 1. The difference of all these from the *Scripture* in regard of our *yielding assent* to them; for that is it, which he begins with, that we are not in the least to doubt, whether any thing contained therein be true or no; and then comes the other in by way of immediate *Antithesis*; but, the *Writings of Bishops, &c.* and although there be a gradation in all these, yet all of them are therein different from *Scripture*, that *whatsoever is found there may neither be doubted nor disputed; but the Writings of Bishops may be doubted or disputed of, because they may be corrected by other Bishops or Councils. And those National Councils may be, because they may be corrected by General; and even these General Councils cannot require such an undoubted assent as the Scripture doth, because the former may be amended by the latter.* So that if you take the scope of St. *Austin's* Discourse in this Place, whether he speaks generally, or particularly, nothing can be more evident, than that he puts this Difference between the *Scriptures*, and all other *Writings or Councils*, that the one may not at all be doubted or disputed of, but the other may: and the common reason of all is, because none are so *Infallible*, but they may be corrected by something besides themselves, which cannot be in any Sense said of the *Scripture*. 2. Although Saint *Austin* adds that Clause, *Si quid in eis forte à veritate deviatum est, If they have erred from the Truth*, only where he speaks of the *Writings of Bishops*; yet the series of his Discourse implies, that it should be understood in what follows too: that, as the *Writings of Bishops* may be corrected by *Councils*, if they have erred, so *National Councils* may be corrected by *General*, if they have erred; and so former *General Councils* by latter on the same *Supposition* still, that they have erred. For, as the *Errors* was supposed to be the ground of *Correction* in the former, it must be likewise of *Amendment* here. And whatever is not so perfect, but that it may be amended, cannot be supposed *Infallible*; for, if the Persons had been *Infallible*, who had made those *Decrees in General Councils*, they would have prevented any necessity of further *Amendments* by succeeding *Councils*. So that, take *Amendment* in what sense you will, either for supplying *Defects*, or correcting *Errours*, it is destructive to your Pretence, that the *Decrees of General Councils* are *Infallible*, and as certain as the *Scripture*. Which is so repugnant to the scope of this Speech of S. *Austin*, as nothing can be more. Your *Criticism* then, from the signification of *emendare* from *menda*, and *menda* from *minus*, and so importing only the taking away any defect, yields you no Relief at all. For that *Defect* which is supposed in *General Councils*, which needs that *Emendation*, doth sufficiently argue, there was no *Infallible Assistance* of the *Spirit of God* in the *Decrees of those Councils*. For where *God's Spirit* assists *Infallibly*,

C. Faustum.
l. 20. c. 21.

Ibid.

P. 244.

bly, it leaves no such *Defects* as are necessary to be amended afterwards, by some other Council which can pretend to no higher Assistance than the other had before. But your critical Judgment is not extraordinary, if you will have the Signification of Words taken from the conjectural *Etymologies* of them, such as this of *Scaliger* is in the place where he corrects *Varro's Etymologies* (at the end of his *Conjectanea*) but, besides that, all Attempts of that Nature are but *Conjectural Essays*, it is but an ill way to judge of the use of a Word by the *Etymology* of it; for, What Multitudes of Words are carried further in their Sense, than their *Originals* would bear? His Lordship therefore takes a far surer way to know *S. Austin's* meaning, than running to *Martinus* for the Signification of the Word *menda*; which is, by producing a parallel Place in *S. Austin*, where it is taken for to correct, and supposes an evident Fault? *aliud quod præcipere jubemur, aliud quod emendare præcipimur*; where *emendare* is, plainly to amend something amiss, not to supply something defective. So that *Stapleton's* Sense of amending by *Explanation* of something not fully known, and not by *Correction* of something erroneous, cannot here have place. For, as his Lordship well observes, the *National Council*, which *S. Austin* did in this Dispute speak most of, was not guilty meely of not fully explaining it self, but of a positive Error, viz. that under *S. Cyprian*, determining that *Baptism of Hereticks was no Baptism*. And therefore when *S. Austin* speaks of Amendment, it is such an Amendment as doth suppose Error, and not barely defect. And so the Words used before of *reprehension* and *yielding*, do both imply more than a bare Explanation; and those which follow after, evince it fully, where *St. Austin* lays down the Cautions, whereby such Amendments should be made, *without sacrilegious Pride, or swelling Arrogancy, without Contention of Envy, and in holy Humility, in Catholick Peace, in Christian Charity*. All which Words were very needless, if he meant only an Explanation of something not fully declared before; but are very necessary, supposing it to be the Amendment of some former Error. All the Answer you have, is, That these last Words relate not in particular to General Councils (by no means, although they follow them at the Heels) but to the other several Subjects, viz. private Bishops, Provincial and National Councils; which are subject to Pride, Arrogancy, and Contention in their Emendations. But, Was not *S. Austin* an unhappy Man then at expressing himself, that he must needs set those Caveats after he had spoken of General Councils, which refer to the Particulars that went before, without any reference to the immediate Antecedents? For if they do at all respect the Proceedings of General Councils, (as doubtless they do, and that most immediately, as appears to any one who reads them) then they imply still, that this Amendment of General Councils must be done without Pride, Arrogance and Envy, and with the greatest Humility, and Peace, and Charity; which it is hard to conceive why *S. Austin* should add, unless he supposed some Errors to be amended in them. Nothing remains further for the clearing this Place, but only that his Lordship mentions that which he calls. *The poorest shift of all in Bellarmin*, viz. that he speaks of unlawful Councils: and it is a sign it is so indeed, when you have nothing more to say for it, but only, that it was given ex superabundanti, and with a Peradventure. When his Lordship concludes, that the Pope's Confirmation to make Councils Infallible, is a meer trick, and unknown to the ancient Church; you have nothing more to prove it to be grounded on the Practice of Councils of the Church, and of Reason, but to refer the Reader back to what you have said about the Pope's Supremacy; and therefore I must do so too, for an Answer to what you have said on that Subject. The

The next thing which belongs to this Question, is contained in his Lordships sixth Consideration; which is, *If the Definition of a General Council be Infallible, then the Infallibility of it, is either in the Conclusion, and in the Means that prove it; or in the Conclusion, not the Means; or in the Means, not the Conclusion. But it is Infallible in none of these. Not in the first; for there are divers Deliberations in General Councils, where the Conclusion is Catholick, but the means by which they prove it, not Infallible. Not in the second; for the Conclusion must always follow the Nature of the Premises, or Principles out of which it is deduced; therefore if those which the Council uses, be sometimes uncertain, the Conclusion cannot be Infallible. Not in the third; for the Conclusion cannot but be true and necessary, if the means be so.* Your answer is, *That it is Infallible in the Conclusion, that is, in the Doctrine defined, though it be not Infallible in the Means, or Arguments upon which it proceeded to the Definition. And your Reason is, because one is necessary for the Government of the Church, but the other is not; for, Deus non deficit in necessariis, nec redundat in superfluis.* You mean, it is necessary for you to assert it, whether it hath any Foundation in Reason or no: For you have not yet proved, that the *Infallibility of General Councils* is necessary for the Churches Government, and therefore cannot thence infer so great an Absurdity as this; that, where all the *Premises* are fallible and uncertain, yet the *Conclusion* may be prophetic and Infallible. But so involved and obscure are your Discourses on this subject, that while you pretend a *General Council* is *seeing Visions*, one might easily believe you were *dreaming Dreams*. For, I pray, speak out, and tell us, what you mean by *Councils being fallible in the use of Means, and yet Infallible in the Conclusion* drawn from those *Premises*, which she was fallible in the deducing the Conclusion from? For the deducing the Conclusion, is in the *use of the Means*; therefore how is it possible that the *Council* should be *Infallible* in the *Conclusion*, when it was fallible in making that *Conclusion*? But it may be I do not yet fully apprehend what you would have, neither I doubt do you. For you would fain be *Infallible* in the *Conclusion* too, without so much as *Truth* in the *Premises*. But I shall attempt to make you speak intelligibly; it must be one of these two things you mean, when you say, *Councils are Infallible in the Conclusion*, either that they are *Infallible in deducing the Conclusion*, or in *assenting to the Conclusion*. If *Infallible* in the deducing the *Conclusion*, then it must be *Infallible in the use of the Means*; for, unless it doth infallibly discern the *Connexion* of the *Premises*, it is impossible it should be *Infallible* in drawing the *Conclusion* from them. So that it is *Nonsense*, and a *Contradiction* to say, That, a *Council* is *Infallible* in the drawing a *Conclusion*, and not *Infallible* in the *use of the Means*, For, it is to say, It is *Infallible*, and not *Infallible* at the same time, and about the same thing, and in the same manner. For, What is drawing a *Conclusion*, but a discerning that *Truth* which results from the *Connexion* of the *Premises* together? For that which is concluded, hath all its *Truth* depending upon the Evidence of the *Premises*, otherwise it is a *simple Proposition*, and not a *Conclusion*. If you had then said, That the *Spirit of God* did *immediately reveal* to the *Council* the *Truth* of what was to be decreed; you had spoken that which might have been understood, though not believed; but this you durst not say, for fear of the charge of *Enthusiasms*, and new *Revelations*: but when you say, The *Council* must *use Means*, and make *Syllogisms*, as other fallible Creatures do, but then it is *Infallible* in the drawing the *Conclusion* from the *Premises* (though it be fallible in the *Connexion* of those *Premises*) is an unparall'd Piece of profound Nonsense.

T t t

For,

p. 13.
P. 248.

P. 263.

For, suppose the matter the Council was to determine, was the *Pope's Infallibility*; in order to the proving this, you say, The Council must use all Arguments tending to prove it; there comes in *Christ's Prayer for S. Peter, that his Faith should not fail*, and that this must be extended to his *Successors*, thence the Argument is formed. *Whomsoever Christ prayed for, that his Faith should not fail, is Infallible*; but *Christ prayed for the Pope, that his Faith should not fail*; therefore *he is Infallible*. Now you say, The Council is fallible in the use of the Means for this Conclusion, *i. e.* it may not infallibly believe the Truth of the major or minor Proposition, but yet it may infallibly deduce thence the Conclusion, though all the Strength of the Conclusion depends upon the Truth of the Premises. You must therefore either assert that the Decrees of Councils are immediately revealed as *Divine Oracles*, or else that they are fallible Conclusions drawn from fallible Premises. And, were it not for a little Shame, because of your charging others with *immediate Revelations*, I doubt not but you would assert the former; which you must of Necessity do, if you will maintain the *Infallibility of General Councils*: For if there be any Infirmary in the use of the Premises, it must of Necessity be in the Conclusion too. But, suppose you mean an *Infallible Assent to the Matter of the Conclusion*, though it be fallibly deduced, you are as far to seek as ever; for, Whereon must that Assent be grounded? It must be either upon the Truth of the Premises, or something immediately revealed: If on the Truth of the Premises, the Assent can be no stronger than the Grounds are on which it is built; if on something revealed, it must needs be still an *immediate Revelation*. But I forget my self all this while, to urge you thus with Absurdities consequent from Reason; for, in answer to his Lordship, you grant, *That it is a thing altogether unknown in Nature, and Art too, that fallible Principles can either as Father or Mother, beget or bring forth an Infallible Conclusion*; for, when his Lordship had objected this, you return him this Answer, *That this is a false Supposition of the Bishop, for the Conclusion is not so much the Child of those Premises (i. e. it is not the Conclusion) as the Fruit of the Holy Ghost, directing and guiding the Council, to produce an Infallible Conclusion, whatever the Premises be (true, or false, certain, or uncertain, all is a Case.) This is necessary for the Peace and Unity of the Church (to believe Contradictions) and therefore not to be denied, unless an impossibility be shewed therein.* (I doubt, believing Contradictions is accounted no Impossibility with you.) But, I hope, no man will attack God's Omnipotency, and deprive him of the Power of doing this. Is it come to that at last? Whatever you assert that is repugnant to the common reason of Mankind, and involves Contradictions in it, that you call for God's Omnipotency to help you in. Thus *Transubstantiation* must be believed, because *God is Omnipotent*; and that Men may believe any thing, though not grounded on Scripture, and repugnant to Reason, because *God is Omnipotent*. We acknowledge God's Omnipotency, as much as you, but we dare not put it to such servile Uses, to make good any absurd Imaginations of our Brains. If you had said, It was possible for God to enlighten the Minds of the Bishops in a General Council, either to discern infallibly the Truth of the Premises, or immediately to reveal the Truth of the Conclusion, you had spoken intelligible Falshoods. But to say, that God permits them to be fallible in the use of the Means, and in drawing the Conclusion from them; but to be Infallible in the Conclusion it self, without any *immediate Revelation*, and then to challenge God's Omnipotency for it: I know not whether it be a greater Dishonour to God, or Reproach to Humane Understanding. And if such Incongruities as these are,

do not discover that you are miserably hampered, as his Lordship saith, in this Argument, I know not what will.

But we must proceed to discover more of them; two things his Lordship very rationally objects against Stapleton's Assertion, *That the Council is discursive in the use of the means, but prophetic in delivering the Conclusion.*

Ø. 14.
P. 249.

1. *That since this is not according to Principles of Nature and Reason, there must be some supernatural Authority, which must deliver this Truth (which, saith he, must be the Scripture) For if you fly to immediate Revelations; the Enthusiasm must be yours. But the Scriptures which are brought, in the very Exposition of all the Primitive Church, neither say it, nor enforce it. Therefore Scripture warrants not your Prophecy in the Conclusion. Neither can the Tradition: Produce one Father, who says, This is an Universal Tradition of the Church, that her Definitions in a General Council are prophetic, and by immediate Revelation: Produce any one Father that says it of his own Authority, that he thinks so.* To all this you very gravely say nothing; and we can shrewdly guess at the Reason of it. 2. His Lordship proves, *That it is a Repugnancy to say, That the Council is prophetic in the Conclusion, and discursive in the use of the Means; for no Prophet, in that which he delivered from God as Infallible Truth, was ever discursive at all in the use of the means; Nay (saith he) make it but probable in the ordinary Course of Prophecy, and I hope you go no higher, nor will I offer at God's absolute Power (but his Lordship was deceived in you, for you run to God's Omnipotency) that that which is discursive in the means, can be prophetic in the Conclusion, and you shall be my great Apollo for ever.* And this, he shews, is contrary to what your own Authors deliver concerning the nature and kinds of Prophecy, and that none of them were by discourse. To this you answer, *That both Stapleton and you deny that the Church is simply prophetic, either in the Premises or Conclusion, but rather the quite contrary; and that by the Definition of the Councils being prophetic in an Analogical Sense, no more is meant but that by virtue of divine Assistance and Direction, such a Conclusion or Definition, in regard of precise Verity, is as infallibly true and certain, as if it were a Prophecy.* But if you had a mind that we should understand, or believe what you say, Why do not you come more out of the Clouds, and shew us the Difference between that which is simply prophetic, and that which is only Analogically so, but as infallibly true and certain as the other? But, that you may no longer blind the World with such insignificant Discourses, I shall put you upon speaking more distinctly, by enquiring into those Ways, whereby God may be supposed supernaturally to work upon the Minds of Men, in order to the Discovery of Truth. These two Ways we may conceive that God may make known Truth to the Minds of Men. 1. *By the immediate discovery of something, which could not otherwise be known but by immediate Revelation: And of this Nature were all those future Events which were revealed to the Prophets, and this I suppose you call simply prophetic; so likewise all those Doctrines which are of pure Revelation, i. e. such as could never have been known, unless God had revealed them: of which kind there are several in the Gospel.* 2. *God may discover such Things to the minds of men, which, though they might otherwise be known, yet not with that degree of certainty, as by this immediate Assistance of God's Spirit: Now this I suppose, is that you call Analogically prophetic, which you assert to differ nothing at all from Prophecy, in regard of Infallible Truth and Certainty, being by virtue of divine Assistance and Direction.* And this you say a General Council hath, but not the former.

P. 264.

T t t 2

Now

p. 15.

Now to convince you of the Absurdity of your Assertions, I shall shew you these two things. 1. *That this cannot be without an immediate Revelation.* 2. *That being so, it cannot be discursive, as you say it is in the use of the means.* 1. *That this cannot be without an immediate Revelation:* For which I need nothing but your own Assertions, viz. that this is a higher discovery of Truth, than nature can ever attain to, or ordinary Grace; and that it is such as obliges all men to an internal assent to it, when it is declared. Now I shall desire you, or any of your party, to tell me, What Difference there is between this, and the *Inspiration* which the *Apostles* had in writing the *Books of Scripture*. I mean not such as contain *Prophecies* in them, but those which deliver to us the *Gospel of Christ*: as for Instance, in *S. John's Gospel*, he doth not pretend to deliver any thing which was not revealed before, but to give an Account of the *Doctrine* and life of *Christ*. And so that *Inspiration* was not simply prophetic, as in writing the *Prophecies* in the *Apocalypse*, but Analogically so, in that such an Assistance of *God's Spirit*, as made what he writ, to be as infallibly true and certain, as if it were a *Prophecy*, which are your own Words concerning the *Infallibility of Councils*. Shew us therefore any rational Difference between this kind of *Infallibility*, and that *Inspiration* by which the *Books of Scripture* are written. If you say, the one was immediate and the other not, you beg the Question; For I am proving that what you assert, doth necessarily imply, that it is as immediate as that which the *Apostles* had. Nay, I will go yet further, and say it is as immediate as that which the *Apostles* themselves had in Council. For when they said, *It seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us*, Can any thing more possibly be understood, than that the *Spirit of God* did so far assist their minds, that they should not err in their Definitions? And therefore when of late you are grown (forsooth) somewhat jealous of the word *Infallibility*, and you give us a grave Advertisement at the end of your Preface, that you do not mean by it an *intrinsic unerring power in all things, in those whom you account Infallible, but only that they never have erred, nor shall err in definitions of Faith*; you do not at all advantage your selves by it. For none of your considerate Adversaries do charge you so much with usurping *God's incommunicable Attribute of Infallibility*, (which is thereby avoided because you pretend to derive it from him) but that you challenge the same *Infallibility* which the *Apostles* had. And so must of Necessity assert as much of *Divine Enthusiasm* and *immediate Revelation* in your Church, as any of the *Apostles* themselves had. For whatever they had, came by virtue of *Christ's Promise*, and that is all you say for the Churches *Infallibility*; but that doth no more take it off from being an *immediate Revelation* in the Church, than it did in the *Apostles*. If you say, *The Church is only secured that it neither hath erred, nor can err in Definitions of Faith*, What more had the *Apostles* than this? And if this in them did require an *immediate Inspiration*, certainly it must do so in the Church too. But you say, *Neither Church nor Council do publish immediate Revelations, nor create any new Articles of Faith, but only declare and unfold by their Definitions, that Doctrine, which Christ and his Apostles in some manner first delivered*. But all this, supposing it true, doth not hinder, but the *Councils Infallibility* must imply an *immediate Revelation* on the part of the Council, though not of the *Doctrine* decreed by them. For granting the *Decrees* of the Council are no new *Articles of Faith* (which is yet contrary to your own Principles; for if by the Definitions of Councils that may be *de fide* which was not before, then the Councils do make new *Articles of Faith*, though not new *Doctrines*) i. e. that the matter of them in some manner was before revealed, yet since you say the Council in declaring them,

Ibid.

them, hath an Infallibility, equal to Prophecy, it must be by *immediate Inspiration*. For, Hath the Council greater Certainty, and higher Assistance than any ordinary Believer hath or not? If not, it can be no more *Infallible* than an ordinary Believer; if it hath, it must be *immediate*, because it hath a higher degree of Certainty, than can be attained by the *use of means*. And to say this, as you do expressly, when you assert the Council fallible in the *use of Means*, but infallible in the *Conclusion*, is a most palpable Contradiction. For, it is to assert a *Certainty* beyond and above the *use of means*, and yet not *immediate*. But here lies your perpetual Mistake, as though nothing could be an *immediate Revelation*, but what is a *Revelation* of some *Doctrine never revealed before*: whereas if there be a further Explanation of that Doctrine in as *Infallible* a manner as the *Apostles* at first revealed it, that *Explanation* is by as *immediate* a *Revelation*, as the first Discovery of it. As is clear in the Council of the *Apostles*, for I hope you will not deny, but the non-obligation of the Ceremonial Law was in *some manner revealed to them before*; and yet I hope you will not say, but the *Apostles* had an *immediate Revelation* as to what they decreed in that Council. It is very plain therefore, that when you say, *General Councils neither have erred nor can err in their Definitions*, they usurp as great a Privilege thereby as ever the *Apostles* had, and in order to it must have as *immediate* an *Inspiration*. For, never was there any such *Infallibility*, either in the *Prophets* or *Apostles*, as did suppose an *absolute Impossibility of Error*; but it was wholly *hypothetical* in case of *Divine Assistance*, which hindered them from any Capacity of erring so long as that continued with them and no longer. For, *Inspiration* was no *permanent Habit*, but a *transient Act* in them; and that being removed, they were liable to Errors as well as others; from whence it follows, that where *Revelations* were most *immediate*, they did no more than what you assume to your Church, viz. *preserve them from actual Error in declaring God's Will*. So that nothing can be more evident than that you challenge as great an *Infallibility*, and as *immediate Assistance of God's Spirit* in Councils as ever the *Prophets* and *Apostles* had. And therefore that *Divine* was in the right, of whom *Canus* speaks, who asserted, *That since General Councils were Infallible, their Definitions ought to be equalled with the Scriptures themselves*. And although *Canus* and others dislike this, it is rather because of the *odium* which would follow it, than for any just Reason they give, why it should not follow. For they not only suppose as great a *Certainty* or *Infallibility* in the *Decrees* of both, but an equal *Obligation* to *internal Assent* in those to whom they are declared. Which doth further prove, that the *Revelation* must be *immediate*: for if by virtue of those *Definitions*, we are obliged to *assent* to the *Doctrines* contained in them as *Infallibly true*, there must be an *immediate Divine Authority* which must command our *Assent*. For nothing short of that can oblige us to believe any thing as of *Divine Revelation*; now Councils require, that we must believe their *Definitions* to be *Divine Truths*, though Men were not *obliged* to believe them to be so, before those *Definitions*. For that is your express Doctrine, *That though the Matters decreed in Councils were in some manner revealed before, yet not so as to oblige all Men with an explicate assent to believe them*; but after the *Definitions* of Councils they are bound to do it. So that though there be not an *Object* newly revealed, yet there ariseth a new *Obligation* to *internal Assent*; which *Obligation* cannot come but from *immediate Divine Authority*. If you say, *The Obligation comes not simply by virtue of the Council's Definitions, but by a Command extant in Scripture, whereby all are bound to give this Assent to the Decrees of Councils*;

Councils; I then say, we must be excused from it, till you have discharged this new *Obligation* upon yourself, by producing some express Testimony of *Scripture* to that purpose; which is, I think, sufficient to keep our Minds at Liberty from this *internal Assent* to the Definitions of *General Councils* by virtue of any *Infallibility* in them. And thus having more at large considered the Nature of this *Infallibility* which you challenge to *General Councils*, and having shewed that it implies as *immediate a Revelation* as the *Apostles* had; the second thing is sufficiently demonstrated, *That this Infallibility cannot suppose discursiveness with Fallibility in the use of the means*, because these two are repugnant to each other.

- ¶ 16. The next thing to be considered, is, Stapleton's Argument, why Councils must be Prophetical in the Conclusion; because that which is determined by the Church is matter of Faith, and not of Knowledge, and the assent required else would not be an assent of Faith, but an Habit of Knowledge. To which his Lordship answers, *That he sees no Inconvenience in it, if it be granted; for one and the same Conclusion may be Faith to the Believer, that cannot prove; and knowledge to the learned, that can.* Which he further explains thus: *Some supernatural Principles which Reason cannot demonstrate simply, must be supposed in order to Faith; but these Principles being owned, Reason being thereby inlightned, that may serve to convert or convince Philosophers, and the great Men of Reason in the very point of Faith where it is at the highest.* This he brings down to the Business of Councils; as to which, he saith, *that the first immediate, fundamental Points of Faith, as they cannot be proved simply by Reason, so neither need they be determined by any Council, nor ever were they attempted, they are so plain set down in Scripture. If about the Sense and true meaning of these, or necessary Deduction out of the prime Articles of Faith, General Councils determine anything, as they have done at Nice and the rest; there is no Inconvenience, that one and the same Canon of the Council should be believed as it reflects upon the Articles and Grounds indemonstrable; and yet known to the Learned, by the means and proof, by which that Deduction is vouched and made good.* And again the conclusion of a Council, suppose that in Nice about the Consubstantiality of Christ with the Father, in it self considered, is indemonstrable by Reason; there (saith he) I believe, and assent in Faith: but the same conclusion if you give me the ground of Scripture and the Creed (for somewhat must be supposed in all whether Faith or Knowledge) is demonstrable by natural Reason against any Arrian in the World. So that he concludes, *The weaker sort of Christians may assent by Faith, where the more learned may build it on Reason, the Principles of Faith being supposed.* This is the Substance of his Lordship's Discourse. In Answer to which, you tell us, *That the Bishop seems to broach a new Doctrine, that the assent of Faith may be an Habit of Knowledge.* But surely (say you) Divine Faith is according to the Apostle, Heb. 11. *an Argument of things which do not appear, viz. by the same means, by which we give this assent of Faith: otherwise our Faith would not be free and meritorious.* An Answer I must needs say, hugely suitable to your Principles, who are most concerned of all Men to set Reason at a distance from Faith; and so you do sufficiently in this Discourse of it. For it is no easie matter to understand what you mean, but that is not to be wondered at, since you make Obscurity so necessary to Faith. *Divine Faith is (you say) an Argument of things which do not appear. viz. by the same means, by which we give this assent of Faith.* Do you mean that the Objects of Faith do not appear? Or that the Reason of believing doth not? If only the former, which is all the Apostle means; that is nothing to your purpose, for we are not enquiring, whether Men may not believe
- P. 251.
- P. 265.

believe the Things which are not seen, but, whether the assent of Faith may not be consistent with Reason: which I am so far from thinking any strange Doctrine, that I cannot see how there can be an assent of Faith without Reason. And they must be such great Meriters at God's Hands, as you are, who must think to oblige him with believing what you cannot understand, or see any Ground in Reason for. For, assent being an Act of the Mind, cannot be elicited without sufficient Reason perswading the Mind to it; or else, it is so far from being free, and as you (who are so loth to be beholding to God) call it, meritorious, that it is brutish and irrational. Not that there are Demonstrations to be expected for every thing we believe, but there must be sufficient Reason for the Mind to build its assent upon, and that Reason is Evidence, and that Evidence destroys that Obscurity which you make necessary to Faith. Evidence, I say, not of the Object, but of the Reason and Obligation to assent. When you say, That Faith, as Faith, cannot be Knowledge, his Lordship grants it; but yet it doth not thence follow, that what may be believed by one may not be known by another; and though Christ (as you add) did not set up a School of Knowledge but of Faith, yet he did not set up a School of blind implicit Faith, but such a one as consists of a rational and discursive Act of the Mind. You must not therefore expect that we should believe the Definitions of Councils because they pretend to be Infallible, but you must first convince our Reasons that they are so, and then we shall assent to them. But you have very well contrived your Business, to have an obscure, implicate Faith, for such Doctrines which are so far from any Evidence of Reason.

C H A P. II.

110:1-C Of the Use and Authority of General Councils.

The denying the Infallibility of General Councils takes not away their Use and Authority. Of the Submission due to them by all particular Persons. How far external Obedience is required in case they err. No violent Opposition to be made against them. Rare Inconveniences hinder not the effect of a just Power. It cannot rationally be supposed, that such General Councils as are here meant should often or dangerously err. The true Notion of a General Council explained. The Freedom requisite in the Proceedings of it. The Rule it must judge by. Great difference between external Obedience, and internal assent to the Decrees of Councils. This later unites Men in Error, not the former. As great Uncertainties supposing General Councils Infallible as not. Not so great certainty requisite for Submission as Faith. Whether the Romanists Doctrine of the Infallibility of Councils, or ours, tend more to the Churches Peace? St. Austin explained. The Keys according to him given to the Church. No unremediable Inconvenience, supposing a General Council err. But Errors in Faith are so, supposing them Infallible when they are not. The Church hath Power to reverse the Decrees of General Councils. The Power of Councils not by Divine Institution. The Unreasonableness of making the Infallibility of Councils depend on the Pope's Confirmation. No consent among the Romanists about the Subject of Infallibility, whether in Pope or Council. No Evidence from Scripture, Reason, or Antiquity, for the Pope's Personal Infallibility.

THE first Question being thus dispatched, I now come to the second, which is, Of what Use and Authority General Councils are in the Church, supposing them not Infallible. And here again two things are to be examined;

§. I.

examined; first, *How far General Councils are to be submitted to.* Secondly, *Whether our Opinion or yours tend more to the Peace of the Church;* for both these his Lordship handles distinctly, and so shall we. For the first, nothing is more necessary than thoroughly to understand his Lordship's meaning, which he most fully delivers in these Words. General Councils lawfully called and ordered and lawfully proceeding, are a great and awful Representation, and cannot err in Matters of Faith, keeping themselves to God's Rule, and not attempting to make a new one of their own; and are with all Submission to be observed by every Christian, where Scripture, or evident Demonstration, comes not against them. Two things you mainly object against this Opinion. 1. That in case such a Council err, it tends only to unite Men in Error. 2. Who shall be Judge of all those Conditions implied in the Councils Proceedings? To these two, all that I can find material scattered up and down in your Discourse on this Subject, may be reduced. For the first, we must consider the occasion of his Lordship's Entrance into this Subject concerning General Councils, how far they may err, or not, which he saith is a Question of great Consequence in the Church of God. For to say they cannot err, leaves the Church not only without Remedy against an Error once determined; but also without Sense that it may need a Remedy, and so without care to seek it, which is the Misery of the Church of Rome at this Day. To say they can err, seems to expose the Members of the Church to an uncertainty and wavering in the Faith, to make unquiet Spirits not only to disrespect former Councils of the Church, but also to slight and contemn whatsoever they may now determine. So that, great Inconveniences appearing on both sides, his Lordship endeavours to steer his Course so as not to dash on the Rocks of either side, by betraying the Churches Faith in asserting their Infallibility, or the Churches Peace by acknowledging them fallible. But as he could not see any Reason to believe them Infallible, so neither could he see any Necessity that the Churches Peace should be broken, supposing them not to be so. And the most obvious Objection being, If a General Council be fallible, what is to be done in case it should err? For that, he propounds this Expedient, That the Determination of a General Council erring was to stand in Force, and to have external Obedience at the least yielded to it, till Evidence of Scripture, or a Demonstration to the contrary made the Error appear; and until thereupon another Council of equal Authority did reverse it. And he after explains what he means by this external Obedience, viz. That which consists in Silence, Patience, and Forbearance yielded to it: which he builds on this Reason, That Controversies arising in the Church must have some end, or they'll tear all in sunder: therefore supposing a General Council should err, and an erring Decree be by the Law it self invalid, I would have it, (saith he) wisely considered again (supposing the Council not to err in Fundamental Verity) whether it be not fit to allow a General Council that Honour and Privilege, which all other great Courts have; Namely, that there be a Declaration of the Invalidity of its decrees, as well as of the Laws of other Courts, before private Men can take Liberty to refuse Obedience. Therefore he concludes, That this seems most fit and necessary for the Peace of Christendom, unless in case the Error be manifest and intolerable, or that the whole Church upon peaceable and just Complaint of this Error neglect or refuse to call a Council to examine it: and there come in National and Provincial Councils to reform for themselves. These Words contain the full account of his Lordship's Opinion, which you charge with so many Interclashings and Inconveniences. The first of which is, That it tends only to oblige all the Members of the Church to an Unity in Error against Scripture and Demonstration, during their whole Lives, or rather to the World's end; since such an Utopian rectifying Council as the Bishop here

Fancies,

Fancies, is morally impossible ever to be had; and therefore you call it a strange (not to say an impious) Doctrine, advanced without Authority of God's Word, or Antiquity, nay contrary to all solid Reason.

This being a Charge of the highest Nature, and managed with such unmeasurable Confidence, we must somewhat further enquire into the Grounds of his Lordship's Opinion, to see whether it be guilty of these Crimes or no. There are three things therefore must be cleared in order to his Lordship's Vindication. 1. The Design of his Discourse. 2. The Suppositions he makes as to the Proceedings of the Council. 3. The Obligation of its Decrees supposing that it should err.

§. 2.

1. *The design of his Discourse* is to be considered; which is to remedy a supposable Inconvenience, and to provide for the Churches Peace. For the first Question in debate was, *Whether a General Council might err, or no.* In which his Lordship gives sufficient Evidence from *Scripture, Antiquity, and Reason*, that it might. But then here comes an Inconvenience to be removed; for his Adversary objects, *What are we then nearer to Unity after a Council hath determined, supposing it may err?* To this his Lordship suits his Answer: wherein we ought to consider, that the Inconvenience objected is, on his Lordship's Suppositions, one of the *rara contingetia*; and such a one ought not to destroy a Principle of Government in all other Cases useful and necessary. For there cannot possibly be any way thought of for Peace and Government, but there may be a Supposition made of some notable Inconvenience; but that not being necessary, nor immediately consequent upon it, but something which may happen and far more probably may not, it ought not to hinder the obtaining of that, which is generally both useful and necessary. To give you a parallel case to this: It is granted on all Hands that the civil Authority of a Nation is Fallible, and therefore we may suppose it actually to err, and that so far as to bind Men by Law to something in it self unlawful. Will you say now, that the intent of civil Authority is to bind Men necessarily to Sin? I hope, you will not; but by this you may easily see the Fallacy of your arguing against his Lordship; for it is an Inconvenience indeed supposable, but not at all necessary; if he had said indeed, that General Councils must necessarily err, your Argument had been strong against him; but as it is, it hath no more Force against his Assertion, than the Supposition before made hath against civil Authority. For that case may be easily put, that such a Law may pass; but, doth this hinder Men from their Obligation to Duty and Submission to a just Authority? or, Will you have Men presently to renounce Obedience, and to repeal such a Law themselves, and not rather in all Ways of Duty and Reverence to Authority make known their just Complaints and desire a Redress by the Hands of Supream Authority? And this is all which his Lordship aims at, that in case a General Council should err (which is not easily imaginable upon his Suppositions) it tends more to the Churches Peace for private Men not to oppose the Decrees of it, but to endeavour that another General Council be called to repeal it, and till then to preserve the Churches Peace, supposing the Error not manifest or intolerable. In this case then there are two Inconveniences put: the one of them is, That when a Council is supposed to err, every particular Man may be at Liberty to oppose the Decrees of it, and so put the Church into Confusion; the other is, That though private Men may know it to be an Error, yet they should be patient till the Church by another Council may repeal it: Now these two Inconveniences being laid together, the Question is, Which is the greater? His Lordship with a great deal of Reason judges the former to be: because in the latter case it is only a

U u u

silencing

- examined; first, *How far General Councils are to be submitted to.* Secondly, *Whether our Opinion or yours tend more to the Peace of the Church;* for both these his Lordship handles distinctly, and so shall we. For the first, nothing is more necessary than thoroughly to understand his Lordship's meaning, which he most fully delivers in these Words. General Councils lawfully called and ordered and lawfully proceeding, are a great and awful Representation, and cannot err in Matters of Faith, keeping themselves to God's Rule, and not attempting to make a new one of their own; and are with all Submission to be observed by every Christian, where Scripture, or evident Demonstration, comes not against them. Two things you mainly object against this Opinion. 1. That in case such a Council err, it tends only to unite Men in Error. 2. Who shall be Judge of all those Conditions implied in the Councils Proceedings? To these two, all that I can find material scattered up and down in your Discourse on this Subject, may be reduced. For the first, we must consider the occasion of his Lordship's Entrance into this Subject concerning General Councils, how far they may err, or not, which he saith is a Question of great Consequence in the Church of God. For to say they cannot err, leaves the Church not only without Remedy against an Error once determined; but also without Sense that it may need a Remedy, and so without care to seek it, which is the Misery of the Church of Rome at this Day. To say they can err, seems to expose the Members of the Church to an uncertainty and wavering in the Faith, to make unquiet Spirits not only to disrespect former Councils of the Church, but also to slight and contemn whatsoever they may now determine. So that, great Inconveniences appearing on both sides, his Lordship endeavours to steer his Course so as not to dash on the Rocks of either side, by betraying the Churches Faith in asserting their Infallibility, or the Churches Peace by acknowledging them fallible. But as he could not see any Reason to believe them Infallible, so neither could he see any Necessity that the Churches Peace should be broken, supposing them not to be so. And the most obvious Objection being, *If a General Council be fallible, what is to be done in case it should err?* For that, he propounds this Expedient, *That the Determination of a General Council erring was to stand in Force, and to have external Obedience at the least yielded to it, till Evidence of Scripture, or a Demonstration to the contrary made the Error appear; and until thereupon another Council of equal Authority did reverse it.* And he after explains what he means by this external Obedience, viz. *That which consists in Silence, Patience, and Forbearance yielded to it: which he builds on this Reason, That Controversies arising in the Church must have some end, or they'll tear all in sunder: therefore supposing a General Council should err, and an erring Decree be by the Law it self invalid, I would have it, (saith he) wisely considered again (supposing the Council not to err in Fundamental Verity) whether it be not fit to allow a General Council that Honour and Privilege, which all other great Courts have; Namely, that there be a Declaration of the Invalidity of its decrees, as well as of the Laws of other Courts, before private Men can take Liberty to refuse Obedience.* Therefore he concludes, *That this seems most fit and necessary for the Peace of Christendom, unless in case the Error be manifest and intolerable, or that the whole Church upon peaceable and just Complaint of this Error neglect or refuse to call a Council to examine it: and there come in National and Provincial Councils to reform for themselves.* These Words contain the full account of his Lordship's Opinion, which you charge with so many Interclashings and Inconveniences. The first of which is, *That it tends only to oblige all the Members of the Church to an Unity in Error against Scripture and Demonstration, during their whole Lives, or rather to the World's end; since such an Utopian rectifying Council as the Bishop here*
- Fancies,*

Fancies, is morally impossible ever to be had; and therefore you call it a strange (not to say an impious) Doctrine, advanced without Authority of God's Word, or Antiquity, nay contrary to all solid Reason.

This being a Charge of the highest Nature, and managed with such unmeasurable Confidence, we must somewhat further enquire into the Grounds of his Lordship's Opinion, to see whether it be guilty of these Crimes or no. There are three things therefore must be cleared in order to his Lordship's Vindication. 1. The Design of his Discourse. 2. The Suppositions he makes as to the Proceedings of the Council. 3. The Obligation of its Decrees supposing that it should err.

§. 2.

1. The design of his Discourse is to be considered; which is to remedy a supposable Inconvenience, and to provide for the Churches Peace. For the first Question in debate was, *Whether a General Council might err, or no.* In which his Lordship gives sufficient Evidence from *Scripture, Antiquity, and Reason*, that it might. But then here comes an Inconvenience to be removed; for his Adversary objects, *What are we then nearer to Unity after a Council hath determined, supposing it may err?* To this his Lordship suits his Answer: wherein we ought to consider, that the Inconvenience objected is, on his Lordship's Suppositions, one of the *rara contingentia*; and such a one ought not to destroy a Principle of Government in all other Cases useful and necessary. For there cannot possibly be any way thought of for Peace and Government, but there may be a Supposition made of some notable Inconvenience; but that not being necessary, nor immediately consequent upon it, but something which may happen and far more probably may not, it ought not to hinder the obtaining of that, which is generally both useful and necessary. To give you a parallel case to this: It is granted on all Hands that the civil Authority of a Nation is Fallible, and therefore we may suppose it actually to err, and that so far as to bind Men by Law to something in it self unlawful. Will you say now, that the intent of civil Authority is to bind Men necessarily to Sin? I hope, you will not; but by this you may easily see the Fallacy of your arguing against his Lordship; for it is an Inconvenience indeed supposable, but not at all necessary; if he had said indeed, that General Councils must necessarily err, your Argument had been strong against him; but as it is, it hath no more Force against his Assertion, than the Supposition before made hath against civil Authority. For that case may be easily put, that such a Law may pass; but, doth this hinder Men from their Obligation to Duty and Submission to a just Authority? or, Will you have Men presently to renounce Obedience, and to repeal such a Law themselves, and not rather in all Ways of Duty and Reverence to Authority make known their just Complaints and desire a Redress by the Hands of Supream Authority? And this is all which his Lordship aims at, that in case a General Council should err (which is not easily imaginable upon his Suppositions) it tends more to the Churches Peace for private Men not to oppose the Decrees of it, but to endeavour that another General Council be called to repeal it, and till then to preserve the Churches Peace, supposing the Error not manifest or intolerable. In this case then there are two Inconveniences put: the one of them is, That when a Council is supposed to err, every particular Man may be at Liberty to oppose the Decrees of it, and so put the Church into Confusion; the other is, That though private Men may know it to be an Error, yet they should be patient till the Church by another Council may repeal it: Now these two Inconveniences being laid together, the Question is, Which is the greater? His Lordship with a great deal of Reason judges the former to be: because in the latter case it is only a

U u u

silencing

silencing of some less necessary *Truth* for some time ; but in the other it is an exposing the *Church* to the fury of Mens turbulent *Spirits*. But that which shews the unreasonableness of your Objection, *That this is the way to bind the Church to an Union in Error*, is, that this doth not necessarily follow from his Lordship's Opinion, but is only a case supposable ; and no rare Inconvenience ought to prejudice a general good : And the Peace of the *Church* in such a case ought to be preferred before private Mens Satisfaction.

Q. 3.

But this will further appear, if we consider, *secondly*, the *Suppositions* his Lordship makes ; for by that we shall see, how rarely incident this case is : for, I hope, the supposing that a *General Council* may err, doth not suppose that it must necessarily err ; and granting those things which are supposed by him, it is a rare case that it should err. For these things are by him supposed. 1. *That it must be a Council lawfully called and ordered* ; and so, not such Councils as that of *Trent* was, or any like it ; wherein the *Pope* gives only a *General Summons*, and that it must be called a *General Council* on that account, how few *Bishops* soever appear in it, nay, though the far greatest part of the *Christian World* be excluded from it : but it must be such a *Council* as may be acknowledged to be *General*, by the *General Consent* of the *Christian World*. For that we would make our *Judge* in the case ; as it was in the four first *General Councils*. Not that we would stand upon *Bishops* being actually present from every particular *Church*, but that such a Number be present from the greatest *Churches*, as may make it not be suspected to be merely a *Faction*, packed together for the *Interest* of some potent *Prelate* ; but that they do so indifferently meet from all *Parts*, that there may be no just ground of Suspicion, that they design any thing but the common good of the *Christian World*. And therefore we acknowledge the first four *General Councils* to be truly such, in our present Sense ; neither do we quarrel at them, because so few *Bishops* were present, who lived out of the *Roman Empire* ; for, supposing the *Church* at the same freedom from particular *Interests* that it was then, and so great a Number of *Bishops* assembled together, we look on it to be so great and awful a *Representation*, that its *Determinations* ought not to be opposed by any *factions* or turbulent *Spirits*. And in case some *Bishops* be not present from some *Churches*, whether *Eastern* or *Western*, yet if upon the publishing those *Decrees*, they be *universally accepted*, that doth, *ex post-facto*, make the *Council* truly *Oecumenical*. By this you see, what we mean by a *General Council*. And, for the calling of it ; though we say, it should be by the consent of the chief *Patriarchs*, yet the Right and Custom of the ancient *Church* clearly carries it, that it ought to be summoned by the Authority of *Christian Princes* : for, nothing can be more evident to such, who will not shut their Eyes against the clearest Evidence, than that the first *General Councils* (before the *Pope* had got the better of the *Emperors*) were summoned by the *Emperor's* Command and Authority ; and since the Division of the *Empire* into so many *Kingdoms* and *Principalities*, the consent of *Christian Princes* is necessary on the same Grounds. Neither ought it only to be a *General Council*, and lawfully called, but lawfully ordered too, viz. that no *Prelate* challenge himself such a *Presidency* not in, but over the *Council*, that his *Instructions* must be looked on as the only *Chart* they must steer their Course by ; and that nothing be debated, but *proponentibus Legatis*, as it was at *Trent* : for these things take away utterly that *Freedom* which is necessary for a *General Council*. And therefore his Lordship justly requires, 2. *That the Council do proceed lawfully* ; which it cannot do, if it be ordered, as the second *Ephesine* was by *Dioscorus* and his

his Party; or if Practices be used, as at *Ariminum*: but there must be the greatest freedom in Debates, no canvassing for Votes, but every one suffered to deliver his Judgment, without Prejudice or Partiality, that those who give their Judgments, deliver their Reasons before, and not only appear in *Pontificalibus*, to give their *Placet*. That the *Bishops* present, be Men of unquestionable Abilities, and generally presumed to be well acquainted with the Matters to be debated there: For otherwise nothing would be more easie, than for the more subtil Men, under ambiguous Expressions, and fair Pretences to bring over a great Number of the rest to them, who want either Judgment or Learning enough to discern their Designs. And this is supposed to be the case of the Council at *Ariminum*, where the *Occidental Bishops*, for want of *Learning* were over-reached by the Subtilty of the *Arrian Party*.

3. His Lordship supposes, *That this Council keeps it self to God's Rule, and not attempt to make a new one of their own*: For in so doing they commit an Error in the first Concoction, which will be incorrigible afterwards. And this is not only reasonable, but just and necessary, because nothing can be a Rule of Faith, but what is of immediate *divine Revelation*; and this hath been the Practice of the first *General Councils*, which never owned or proceeded by any other Rule of *Faith* but this. These things being supposed, May we not justly say, That an erring Determination of such a Council so proceeding, is a rare Case? Since we believe, that God will not deny to any particular Person (who doth sincerely seek it) the *Knowledge of his Truth*, much less may we think he will do it to such an awful Representation of the Church, when assembled together purposely for finding out that Truth, which may be of so great Consequence to the *Christian World*. For both the *Truth of God's Promises*, the *goodness of God to his People*, and his *peculiar Care of his Church*, seem highly concerned, that such a Council should not be guilty of any notorious Error.

But, because we deny not, but such a Council is fallible, therefore we grant the case may be put, that such a Council may err; and the Question is, What is to be done then? *Whether every particular Person may oppose such a Determination, or submit till another Council reverse the Decrees of it*. His Lordship asserts the latter; and so we come to the effect of such an erring Decree, which was the third thing to be spoken to. As to which, these things must be considered, 1. That he doth not assert, that Men are bound to believe the *Truth* of that Decree, but not openly to oppose it. For so he speaks expressly of *external Obedience*, and at least so far as it consists in *Silence, Patience, and Forbearance yielded to it*. And therefore you are greatly deceived, when with such confidence you assert, *That this obliges all the Members of the Church to Unity in Error*; for that is only consequent upon your Principle, that the Decrees of *General Councils* are to be believed by an *internal Assent*: for this indeed would necessarily oblige them to *Unity in Error*; but the most that is consequent on his Lordship's Opinion, is, that in such cases wherein a *General Council* hath erred, Men ought rather to be silent for a time as to some *Truth*, than to break the *Church's Peace*. In the mean time, he doth not deny, but that Men may be bound to follow their own Judgments in the Discovery of Truth; nay, and they may use all means consistent with the *Churches Peace*, to promote that *Truth*; for he allows that *just Complaints may be made to the Church for reversing the Decrees of the former Council*, and this cannot be without discovering the Error of that Council. And I hope this Liberty of dissent and just Complaint, is sufficient to keep all the Members of the Church from being united in Error. And, I pray Sir, What cause is there now for such hideous Out-cries, that this is such a strange

p. 4.

and impious Doctrine, against Scripture, Antiquity, and solid Reason, which appears, for all that I can see, very just and reasonable, taking it in the way which he explains himself in ? But, whereas you object, *That this will keep Men in Error to the World's end, because such a Council is morally impossible*; it is easie to shew you, that if the *rectifying Council* be impossible, the *General erring Council* is equally impossible; therefore there is no danger coming that way neither. And that such *General Councils* are grown such morally impossible things, we may in a great Measure thank your *Church* for it, which hates as much such a *true rectifying Council* (as you call it) as the *Court of Rome* does a *thorough Reformation*. For, all your design is, to persuade Men, that those only are *General Councils*, which have the *Pope's Summons*, and wherein he rules, and, in effect, does all; and to persuade Men to believe the *Decrees* of such *Councils*, is the most effectual way in the World to *unite Men in the belief of Errors to the World's end*. For, as long as the *Pope's Interest* can carry it, to be sure, all *rectifying Councils*, shall be (as you say) *Utopian* too; for he will prevent, if possible, their ever appearing in *Europe*. Therefore all this Discourse of his Lordship doth suppose such a state of the *Church*, as that was in the time of the *Nicene Councils*; and after; when there might be a Liberty of calling such *Councils*, that in case one errs, another might be summoned to reverse it. But this is not to be expected *in facie Romuli*, in this state of the *Christian World*, that there should be such a *General Council* so called, and so proceeding as he supposes, and therefore there is no such danger of *being united in Error*, by vertue of its *Decrees*; but if the state of things would bear such a *Council* so decreeing, we might as well think it would bear another to reverse it, if need were, and then his Lordship's Supposition would come to act, that in the interstice of those *Councils*, private Men ought not to oppose the *Decrees* of the former, but patiently wait till the latter reverse them. But, as things are now in the *Christian World*, his Lordship doth not suppose that any *Council* hath such a Power to oblige, because it calls it self a *General Council*; but a truly *General Council* being, as you say, morally impossible, nothing is left but that the *Church* reform it self by Parts, and wait to give an account of its Proceedings therein, till such a *General Council* as we before described, be assembled in the *Christian World*. Thus we see, how vain and empty your first Objection is, *That from his Lordship's Opinion, it would follow, that the Church must be united in Error*, which is only the direct consequent of your own Assertion, That Men are bound to believe the *Decrees* of those you call *General Councils to be Infallible*.

¶ 5.

P. 242. &c.
P. 260. &c.

Your next great Objection is, *That this Doctrine exposes all to Uncertainties; for, Who shall be Judge, whether it be a lawful Council, and proceeds lawfully? Whether the Errors be fundamental and intolerable or no? Whether there be Scripture and Demonstration against them or no? For, if every Man be Judge, there can be no Submission to any General Council*. This is the force of the many Words, which, in several Places, you spend upon this Subject; and therefore I shall consider them together. I answer therefore, 1. In general, if this be so intolerable an Inconvenience, it is unavoidable upon your own Principles; and therefore it is unreasonable to object that to another, which you cannot quit your self of. For you say, That the *Infallibility of General Councils confirmed by the Pope*, is the best way to end Controversies; but there is not one term in the main Proposition, but is liable to the same Uncertainty which you here object to his Lordship; for, 1. You do not say, that all *Councils* are *Infallible*, but only *General Councils*, Who then shall be judge, whether the *Council* you would have me believe, be *General* or no?

You

You do not say, that all must be there to make a *General Council*, but the *Pope's general Summons* is sufficient: But, *Who must be Judge*, whether that be sufficient or no? You say so; but, I see no Reason for it. Must you be my Judge, or I my own? If I may be my own Judge, so must every one else, and to every Man is left to believe what *Councils to be General* he please himself.

2. You say, *General Councils are Infallible*: Who must be Judge of that too? Must the *Council* be infallibly believed in it? But that is the thing in *Question*. Must the *Pope* be Judge? But no Man (you say) is bound to believe him *Infallible without the Council*. Must the *Scripture* be Judge? But, Who must Judge what the *Sense* of the *Scripture* is? 3. Who must be Judge in what *Sense*, and how far the *Council* is *Infallible*? Who must judge, how the *Council* comes to be *Infallible* in the *Conclusion*, that was fallible in the use of the *Means*? And when any Controversie arises concerning the meaning of the *Decrees* of the *Council*, Who must be Judge, which is the *Infallible Sense* of them? For there is but one *Sense Infallible*, though the Words may bear many, and unless I know which is the *Infallible Sense*, I am not bound to yield my assent to it. But, Who must decide this? The *Council* cannot; for that leaves no Exposition with the *Decrees*. The *Pope* cannot; for he is not *Infallible without the Council*. So that still it falls to every Man's private Reason, to judge of it. 4. Who must be Judge, that the *Pope's Confirmation* is necessary to make the *Decrees Infallible*? Not the *Council* without the *Pope*, nor the *Pope* without the *Council*; for, you say, *We are not bound to believe them Infallible, but as they are together*. And together they cannot, for that is the *Question*, *Why not a Council without the Pope's Confirmation, as well as with it?* and, *When did Pope and Council determine, that no Council without the Pope, is Infallible?* but the contrary hath been determined by a *Council*, viz. that a *Council* is above the *Pope*, and consequently needs not his Confirmation. So that for all your pretending to end Controversies, you leave Men at as great Uncertainties as any whatsoever. Being not able to resolve some of the most necessary Questions, in order to the Churches Peace, according to your own Principles.

2. I answer more particularly, that his Lordship's Opinion doth not expose near to so great Uncertainties as yours doth; upon this Reason, because your requiring an *internal Assent* to the *Decrees of Councils*, and *Infallible Certainty* in all that Men believe, must of Necessity leave Men in the greatest Perplexities, where you cannot give them that kind of *Certainty* on which they may build their Faith; but, his Lordship only requiring *external Obedience* to the *Decrees of Councils*, a far less degree of *Certainty* will be sufficient. That is, such a kind of *Moral Certainty*, as things of that nature are capable of. You ask then, *Who shall be Judge, whether a Council were lawfully called, and did lawfully proceed or no?* I answer, let every Man be Judge according to the general *Sense* and Reason of Mankind. If there were sufficient Authority for calling them together, according to the known Practice of the Church; if there was no plain Ground of *Suspicion* of any Practices by the Power of any particular *Prelate*; no Complaints made of it, either in, or after the *Council*; if there be no plain Evidence that it takes any other Rules for its *Decrees*, but the *Scripture*, then we say, They are bound to yield *external Obedience* to them, supposing the *Council* generally received in the Christian World for a *lawful and General Council*. If you ask again, *How should it be known when Errors are manifest and intolerable, and when not?* We here appeal to *Scripture* interpreted by the concurrent *Sense* of the *Primitive Church*, the *common Reason* of mankind (supposing the *Scripture* to be the *Rule of Faith*) the consent of wise and learned Men; which certainly will prevent the Exorbitances and capricious Humours of any phantastical Spirits,

Spirits, which may cry out, That the most received *Truths*, ever since Christianity was in the World, are *intolerable Errors*. If you are resolved yet further to ask, *Who shall be judge what a necessary Reason or demonstration is?* His Lordships tells you, I think plain enough, from *Hooker*, what is understood by it, *viz. such as being proposed to any man, and understood, the mind cannot chuse but inwardly assent to it.* And, Do you require any other Judge but a Man's own Reason in this Case? But, you say, *Others call their Arguments Demonstrations*; but let them submit to this way of Tryal, and they may soon be convinced that they are not. Still you say, *They will not be convinced, but will break the Peace of the Church, supposing they have sufficient Evidence for what they say.* But if men will be unreasonable, who can help it? Can you, with telling them *Councils* are *Infallible*? I doubt you would hear of more Arguments than you could well satisfy against that presently. We appeal then to the common Reason of Mankind, Whether it be not a far more probable Way to end *Controversies*, to persuade men in disputable Matters, to yield *external Obedience* to the *Decrees* of a *lawful general Council*, than to tell them, they are bound to believe whatever they decree to be *infallibly true*? And therefore you are very much mistaken, *when you say, His Lordship declines the main Question*, which is, *of the necessity of submitting to a living Judge, or a definitive Sentence, in case two Parties, equal for Learning and Integrity, both pretend to equal Evidence for what they say*; for his Lordship doth not deny, but that in such a Case the submitting to a definitive Sentence, may be a reasonable way to end the *Controversie*; but then the Difference between you lies in two things. 1. That you would bind men to *internal Assent to the Decrees of a Council*, as being *Infallible*; but his Lordship saith, They bind to *external Obedience*, as being the *Supremest Judicatory can be expected in the Church*. 2. You pretend, *That Councils called and confirmed by the Pope, are thus Infallible, and our Supreme Judge in Matters of Faith*; his Lordship justly denies that, and says, That a *Free General Council observing the same Conditions which the first did, is the only equal and indifferent Judge*. So that the Question is not so much, Whether there shall be a *living Judge*? as, Who shall be he? And, How far the definitive Sentence binds? And, What is to be done, in case there cannot be a free and indifferent Judge? For in this Case we say, Every Church is bound to regard her own Purity and Peace, and, in case of *Corruptions*, to proceed to a *Reformation* of them.

¶ 6. We now come to the remaining Enquiry, which is, *Whether your Doctrine, or ours, tends more to the Churches Peace?* For clearing of this, his Lordship premises these Things by way of *Considerations*. 1. *That there is no necessity of any such Infallibility in the Church, as was in the Apostles.* 2. *That what Infallibility or Authority belongs to the Church, doth primarily reside in the whole Body of the Church, and not in a General Council.* 3. *That in case a General Council err, the whole Church hath full Authority to represent her self in another Council, and so to redress what was amiss either practised, or concluded.* And so upon these Principles his Lordship saith, *Here is a sufficient Remedy for what is amiss, and yet no infringing any lawful Authority in the Church*; and yet he grants, as the Church of England doth, that a general Council may err. But he saith, *It doth not follow, because the Church may err, therefore she may not govern.* For the Church hath not only a *Pastoral Power* to teach and direct, but a *Prætorian* also, to control and censure too where *Errors or Crimes* are against *Points fundamental, or of great Consequence*. Thus he represents the Advantages which follow upon his Opinion, after which he comes to the Disadvantages of yours. But we must first consider, what you have to object against what his Lordship hath here delivered. To the first you say nothing,

thing, but that Stapleton and Bellarmine attribute more *Infallibility* to the Church, than his Lordship doth, which is an excellent way to prove the Necessity of it, if you had first proved those two Authors Infallible. To the second, your Answer is more large; for his Lordship to confirm what he said, That the Power and Authority given by Christ, lies in the whole Church, produces that saying of S. Austin, That S. Peter did not receive the Keys of the Church, but as sustaining the Person of the Church; from whence he proves against Stapleton, That it is not to be understood finally only for the good of the Church; but that the primary and formal Right is in the Church. For he that receives a thing in the Person of another, receives it indeed to his good and use, but in his right too. To this you answer from Bellarmine, That there is a twofold representing or bearing the Person of another, The one Parabolical, and by way of meer figure and Supposition only; as Agar represented the People of the Jews under Bondage of the Law, &c. The other historical and real, viz. when the Person representing, has right or relation a parte rei, in and towards the thing represented, by Virtue whereof it bears the Person of the thing represented: Now S. Peter, say you, sustained the Person of the Church in this latter Sense, really and historically, and not parabolically, and in figure, i. e. he received the Keys as Head of the Church; though that Reception were ordained for the good of the whole Church. But, Sir, our Enquiry is not, How many Ways one may imagine a Representation to be made, but, What kind of Representation that is, which is suitable to S. Austin's Meaning? That there may be an Allegorical Representation, no Body denies; but I cannot imagine, How it can belong to this Place; or, Who ever meant that S. Peter stood here for an Allegory of the Church? And therefore the Members of your Distinction are not apposite. For those who assert, that S. Peter did sustain the Person of the Church, in his Lordships Sense, do yet acknowledge that he did it *historice*, and not *parabolice*, as you speak, i. e. the Donation was really made to him; but then the Question is, In what Right or Capacity it was made to him, Whether in his personal or representative Capacity? For these are the two only proper Members of a distinction here. St. Austin saith, not only in that Place, but in very many others, that S. Peter did sustain the Person of the Church, when Christ said to him, I will give thee the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven; Now the Question is, In what Sense he sustained the Person of the Church? You say, In his own Right as Head of the Church; We say, As a publick Person representing the Church, not parabolically (for that is no sustaining the Person at all) but really and historically. And that S. Austin means, As a publick Person, appears by the other Expressions in the Places cited, that he did *universam significare Ecclesiam*, signifie the whole Church; and that those things which are spoken of Peter, *Non habent illustrem intellectum nisi cum referuntur ad Ecclesiam cujus ille agnoscitur in figura gestasse personam*, Have no clear sense, but when they are referred to the Church, whose Person he did bear. Can you say this of a King, who receives the Keys of a Town, whereof he takes Possession for himself, though it be for the good of the Kingdom; that he signifies the whole Kingdom in it, and that it cannot have any clear sense, but when it is applied to the Kingdom which he represents? No, this cannot be; for the King takes Possession in his own full Right, and it is not the Possession, but the Administration, which is referred properly to the good of the Kingdom. But this might be properly said of a Duke of Venice, that he takes Possession of a Town in the Person of the State, and that the proper Sense is, that the State took Possession, and he only representing it. So that the full Right lies in the Body of the State, but he as chief Member represents the whole. And this is that which S. Austin means, when

P. 266.

Aug. de Agone
Christiano,
cap. 30.De Pontif. l. 1.
c. 12.Aug. in Psal.
108. in Johan.
tr. 124. Serm.
30. de divers.
Retraç. l. 1.
c. 21.

when he saith, That S. Peter represented the Church, *propter primatum*, for the Primacy which he had amongst the Apostles, i. e. such a Primacy of order, whereby he was fittest to represent the whole Church. For it is impossible to conceive that he should mean that S. Peter should receive this as Head of the Church, when you acknowledge that he was not Head of the Church, till after the Keys were given him. For, you say, The Performance of Christ's Promise, in making him Head of the Church, was not till after his Resurrection. But, Will you say, the Church had no Power of the Keys till then; and then only finally too, and not formally? What became then of the Power of the Keys at S. Peter's death, if only formally in him, and not in the Church? What becomes of them at the death of every Pope? Will you say, as Bellarmine doth, that Christ takes them, and gives them to his Successor? But he must be sure to wait till the Cardinals agree, To whom he must give them. Nothing then could he further from S. Austin's Meaning, than that S. Peter received the Keys, as Head of the Church, and so, that he represented the Church only finally; whereas his Expressions carry it, that he means the formal Right of them was conveyed to the Church, and that S. Peter was only a publick Person, to receive them in the name of the Church. But, whatever S. Austin's Meaning was, the strength of his Lordship's Assertion doth not stand or fall with that; for there are Arguments sufficient besides to prove, that the Authority for governing the Church, was not committed formally to S. Peter, much less to any pretended Successor, but that it primarily and formally resides in the whole Body of the Church. And, were that the thing to be here disputed, you must not think to take it for granted, that if the Keys were given personally to S. Peter, by them was meant the Supreme Authority of governing the Church exclusively of the other Apostles.

Q. 7.
P. 267.

To the third Consideration, you answer, That in case a general Council err, there can be no redress for Error in Faith; for if one Council may err, so may another, and a third, and a fourth, &c. This indeed is very suitable to your Doctrine from the beginning, that a Man can be certain of nothing but what it is impossible should be otherwise. I hope you are certain your self, you do not err; but I suppose you do not think it impossible you should: So, although we do not think it impossible, a Council should err, yet we may be certain it doth not: and, supposing it should, we do not say, It is impossible that a Council should not err, so that another Council may correct the Error of the former. And doubtless Men may be certain of it too; if, as his Lordship saith, plain Scripture, and evident Demonstration be brought against the former Error. But these are strange Doctrines, that because a Council may err, therefore a Council can never afford Remedy against Inconveniencies. For, one great Inconveniency is, the breaking the Church's Peace: that, is remedied by the Council's Authority; another is, Error in Faith, that may be remedied by another Council: No, say you, for that may err too; but, Doth it follow that it must err? Or, Is it probable that it should err? If the former Error be so discovered, and the Council so proceed as his Lordship supposes. For your other Difficulty about the calling another general Council, I have answered it already, when I shewed, what we meant by a general Council, and when it was lawfully call'd. When you after add, That the Church never represented her self in another Council but where the former Council was unlawful; and instance in the Councils of Ariminum and Ephesus: You say the same which his Lordship doth, for these Councils were therefore accounted unlawful because erroneous and factious, and he never asserts the Necessity of calling a new Council, but in those two Cases. But if you would have us account none such, but whom

P. 268.

whom you do, you must excuse us till we see greater Reason for it than we do yet; and so likewise for what follows, that the *Councils which rectified the Errors of those were called by the Pope's Authority, as that of Trent and others were*, which to speak mildly is a gross Untruth.

You urge from his Lordships granting, *That the Church hath a Prætorian Power to controul and censure too, where Errors or Crimes are against Points Fundamental or of great Consequence; that therefore he and all Protestants are justly censured by the Roman Church for opposing those Doctrines which are with her Fundamental and of great Consequence.* But still there is no Difference with you between the *Roman Church* and the *Catholic*; between *Papal Councils*, and *Free and General*; between what she judges Fundamental, and what all are bound to judge so: If you prove then, that we are bound to rely only on the Judgment of your Church, your Consequence is good; but otherwise it is tyed with a Rope of Sand, and therefore we do not fear the *Lasbes* of it. And the same Fault runs through your subsequent Discourse, in which you suppose the *Church infallible in all she Propounds*, which you know is constantly denied, and hath been at large disproved in our *First Part*. For, the ground of your *Resolution of Faith being removed*, I see the Fabrick of your Church falls down with it. For take but away your Pretence of *Infallibility*, and your confounding the *Catholic and Roman Church*; all the rest Moulders, as not being able to stand without them. But that is still your way, if any thing be said of the *Catholic Church*, we must presently understand it of yours; so that it cannot be said in any Sense that the *Church is without spot or wrinkle*, but by you it must be understood presently of the *Doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church universally received as a Matter of Faith*: But till you prove not only your two former Assertions, but that *St. Austin* understood those Words ever in that Sense, your Vindication of that Place in him concerning it, will appear utterly impertinent to your Purpose. And his Lordship's Assertion may still stand good, *That the Church on Earth is not any freer from Wrinkles in Doctrine and Discipline, than she is from Spots in Life and Conversation.*

P. 269.

Ibid.

Having thus vindicated his Lordship's Way from the Objections you raised against it, we must now consider how well you vindicate your own from the *unreasonableness* he charges it with, in several Particulars, 1. *That if we suppose a general Council Infallible, and it prove not so, but that an Error in Faith be concluded; the same erring Opinion, which makes it think it self Infallible, makes the Error of it irrevocable, and so leaves the Church without Remedy.* To this you answer, *Grant false Antecedents and false Premises enough, and what Absurdities will not be consequent, and fill up the Conclusion?* But you clearly mistake the present Business; which is not, Whether *Councils* be Infallible or no? But, Whether Opinion be liable to greater Inconveniencies, that which asserts that they may, or that they cannot err? Will you have your Supposition of the *Infallibility of Councils* taken for a *first Principle*, or a thing as true as the *Scriptures*? So you would seem indeed, by the supposing the *Scriptures not to be God's Word*, which you joyn as the *Parallel, to the supposing general Councils fallible.* But will you say the one is as evident and built on as good Reason, and as much agreed on among Christians as the other is? I suppose, you will not; and therefore it was very absurd and unreasonable to say, *Supposing the Word of God were not so, Errors would be irrevocable, as if general Councils were supposed Infallible and proved not so.* But this is a Question you grant to be disputable among Christians, and will you not give us leave to make a Supposition that it may prove not so? You must consider, we are now enquiring into the *Conveniencies*

p. 8.

P. 258.

P. 269.

P. 270.

when he saith, That S. Peter represented the Church, *propter primatum*, for the Primacy which he had amongst the Apostles, i. e. such a Primacy of order, whereby he was fittest to represent the whole Church. For it is impossible to conceive that he should mean that S. Peter should receive this as Head of the Church, when you acknowledge that he was not Head of the Church, till after the Keys were given him. For, you say, The Performance of Christ's Promise, in making him Head of the Church, was not till after his Resurrection. But, Will you say, the Church had no Power of the Keys till then; and then only finally too, and not formally? What became then of the Power of the Keys at S. Peter's death, if only formally in him, and not in the Church? What becomes of them at the death of every Pope? Will you say, as Bellarmine doth, that Christ takes them, and gives them to his Successor? But he must be sure to wait till the Cardinals agree, To whom he must give them. Nothing then could he further from S. Austin's Meaning, than that S. Peter received the Keys, as Head of the Church, and so, that he represented the Church only finally; whereas his Expressions carry it, that he means the formal Right of them was conveyed to the Church, and that S. Peter was only a publick Person, to receive them in the name of the Church. But, whatever S. Austin's Meaning was, the strength of his Lordship's Assertion doth not stand or fall with that; for there are Arguments sufficient besides to prove, that the Authority for governing the Church, was not committed formally to S. Peter, much less to any pretended Successor, but that it primarily and formally resides in the whole Body of the Church. And, were that the thing to be here disputed, you must not think to take it for granted, that if the Keys were given personally to S. Peter, by them was meant the Supreme Authority of governing the Church exclusively of the other Apostles.

Q. 7.
P. 267.

To the third Consideration, you answer, That in case a general Council err, there can be no redress for Error in Faith; for if one Council may err, so may another, and a third, and a fourth, &c. This indeed is very suitable to your Doctrine from the beginning, that a Man can be certain of nothing but what it is impossible should be otherwise. I hope you are certain your self, you do not err; but I suppose you do not think it impossible you should: So, although we do not think it impossible, a Council should err, yet we may be certain it doth not: and, supposing it should, we do not say, It is impossible that a Council should not err, so that another Council may correct the Error of the former. And doubtless Men may be certain of it too; if, as his Lordship saith, plain Scripture, and evident Demonstration be brought against the former Error. But these are strange Doctrines, that because a Council may err, therefore a Council can never afford Remedy against Inconveniencies. For, one great Inconveniency is, the breaking the Church's Peace; that, is remedied by the Council's Authority; another is, Error in Faith, that may be remedied by another Council: No, say you, for that may err too; but, Doth it follow that it must err? Or, Is it probable that it should err? If the former Error be so discovered, and the Council so proceed as his Lordship supposes. For your other Difficulty about the calling another general Council, I have answered it already, when I shewed, what we meant by a general Council, and when it was lawfully called. When you after add, That the Church never represented her self in another Council but where the former Council was unlawful; and instance in the Councils of Ariminum and Ephesus: You say the same which his Lordship doth, for these Councils were therefore accounted unlawful because erroneous and factious, and he never asserts the Necessity of calling a new Council, but in those two Cases. But if you would have us account none such, but whom

P. 268.

whom you do, you must excuse us till we see greater Reason for it than we do yet; and so likewise for what follows, that the *Councils which rectified the Errors of those were called by the Pope's Authority, as that of Trent and others were*, which to speak mildly is a gross Untruth.

You urge from his Lordships granting, *That the Church hath a Prætorian Power to controul and censure too, where Errors or Crimes are against Points Fundamental or of great Consequence; that therefore he and all Protestants are justly censured by the Roman Church for opposing those Doctrines which are with her Fundamental and of great Consequence.* But still there is no Difference with you between the *Roman Church* and the *Catholick*; between *Papal Councils*, and *Free and General*; between what she judges Fundamental, and what all are bound to judge so: If you prove then, that we are bound to rely only on the Judgment of your Church, your Consequence is good; but otherwise it is tyed with a Rope of Sand, and therefore we do not fear the *Lasbes* of it. And the same Fault runs through your subsequent Discourse, in which you suppose the *Church infallible in all she Propounds*, which you know is constantly denied, and hath been at large disproved in our *First Part*. For, the ground of your *Resolution of Faith being removed*, I see the Fabrick of your Church falls down with it. For take but away your Pretence of *Infallibility*, and your confounding the *Catholick and Roman Church*; all the rest Moulders, as not being able to stand without them. But that is still your way, if any thing be said of the *Catholick Church*, we must presently understand it of yours; so that it cannot be said in any Sense that the *Church is without spot or wrinkle*, but by you it must be understood presently of the *Doctrine of the Roman Catholick Church* universally received as a *Matter of Faith*: But till you prove not only your two former Assertions, but that *St. Austin* understood those Words ever in that Sense, your Vindication of that Place in him concerning it, will appear utterly impertinent to your Purpose. And his Lordship's Assertion may still stand good, *That the Church on Earth is not any freer from Wrinkles in Doctrine and Discipline, than she is from Spots in Life and Conversation.*

P. 269.

Ibid.

Having thus vindicated his Lordship's Way from the Objections you raised against it, we must now consider how well you vindicate your own from the *unreasonableness* he charges it with, in several Particulars, 1. *That if we suppose a general Council Infallible, and it prove not so, but that an Error in Faith be concluded; the same erring Opinion, which makes it think it self Infallible, makes the Error of it irrevocable, and so leaves the Church without Remedy.* To this you answer, *Grant false Antecedents and false Premises enough, and what Absurdities will not be consequent, and fill up the Conclusion?* But you clearly mistake the present Business; which is not, Whether *Councils* be Infallible or no? But, Whether Opinion be liable to greater Inconveniencies, that which asserts that they may, or that they cannot err? Will you have your Supposition of the *Infallibility of Councils* taken for a *first Principle*, or a thing as true as the *Scriptures*? So you would seem indeed, by the supposing the *Scriptures not to be God's Word*, which you joyn as the *Parallel, to the supposing general Councils fallible.* But will you say the one is as evident and built on as good Reason, and as much agreed on among Christians as the other is? I suppose, you will not; and therefore it was very absurd and unreasonable to say, *Supposing the Word of God were not so, Errors would be irrevocable, as if general Councils were supposed Infallible and proved not so.* But this is a Question you grant to be disputable among Christians, and will you not give us leave to make a Supposition that it may prove not so? You must consider, we are now enquiring into the *Conveni-*

p. 8.

P. 258.

P. 269.

P. 270.

encies of these two *Opinions*, and in that Case it is necessary to make such suppositions: And let any reasonable man judge what Opinion can be more pernicious to the Church than yours is, supposing it not to be true: For then it will be necessary for Men to assent to the *grossest Errors*, as the most *Divine* and *Infallible Truths*: And there can be no Remedy imagin'd for the redress of them. If then the Inconvenience of admitting it be so great, Men had need look well to the Grounds on which it is built. And I cannot see any reason men can have to admit any *Infallible proponent in Matters of Faith* to the Church, but on as great and as clear Evidence, as the *Prophets* and *Apostles* had, that they were sent from God. For the Danger may be as great to believe that to be *Infallible* which is not, as not to believe that to be *Infallible* which is: For the believing an Error to be a *Divine Truth*, may be as dangerous to the *Souls* of Men, as the not believing something which is really revealed by God. But to be sure, those who see no reason to believe a *General Council* to be *Infallible*, cannot be obliged to assent to Errors propounded by it; but such who believe it *Infallible* must, whatever the Errors be, swallow them down, without questioning the Truth of them. And it argues how conscious you are of the Falseness of your *Principles*, that you are so loth to have them examined, or so much as a Supposition made that they should not prove true? Whereas *Truth* always invites Men to the most accurate search into it. We see the *Apostles* bid Men search, whether the things they spake were true or no; and those are most commended who did it most, and I hope Men were as much bound to believe them *Infallible* as *General Councils*. But we see how unreasonable you are, you would obtrude such things upon Mens Faith, which must lead them into unavoidable Errors if false, and yet not allow Men the liberty of Examination, whether they be true or no. But such Proceedings are so far from advancing your Cause, that nothing can more prejudice it among rational and inquisitive Men.

P. 359. His Lordship for the clearing this, proceeds to an Instance of an Error defined by one of your *General Councils*, viz. *Communion in one kind*; but that we shall reserve the Discussion of, to the ensuing Chapter; which is purposely allotted for the discovery of those Errors which have been defined by such as you call *General Councils*. Therefore I proceed.

d. 9.
P. 360. 2. His Lordship saith, *Your Opinion is yet more unreasonable, because no Body-collective, whensoever it assembled it self, did ever give more power to the representing Body of it, than a binding Power upon it self and all particulars; nor ever did it give this Power otherwise, than with this Reservation in Nature, that it would call again, and reform, and, if need were, abrogate any Law, or Ordinance upon just Cause made evident that the representing Body had failed in Trust, or Truth. And this Power no Body-collective, ecclesiastical or civil, can put out of it self, or give away to a Parliament, or Council, or call it what you will that represents it.* To this again you answer, *This is only to suppose and take for granted, that a General Council hath no Authority, but what is meerly delegate from the Church Universal which it represents.* I grant, this is supposed in it, and this is all which the Nature of a representative Body doth imply; if you say, there is more than that, you are bound to prove it. Yes, say you, *We maintain its Authority to be of Divine Institution, and when lawfully assembled to act by Divine Right, and not meerly by Deputation and consent of the Church.* But if all the Proof you have for it, be only that which you refer us to in the precedent Chapter, the palpable Weakness of it for any such Purpose hath been there fully laid open. His Lordship saith, *That the Power which a Council hath to order, settle and define Differences arising concerning Faith*

P. 372.

P. 361.

Faith, it hath not by any Immediate Institution from Christ, but it was prudently taken up by the Church from the Apostle's Example. So that to hold Councils to this end, is apparent Apostolical Tradition written; but the Power which Councils have, is from the whole Catholick Church, whose Members they are, and the Churches power from God. You say, True it is, the calling such Assemblies was taken up, and hath for its Pattern the Example of the Apostles, Act. 15. yet surely there is little doubt to be made, but the Apostles had both Direction and Precept too, for doing it so often as just occasion required, from Christ himself. The whole force of which Answer lies in those well placed Words, Surely there is little doubt to be made; for as to any thing of Reason, you never offer at it. Just such another of Bellarmine's sine dubio's comes after; Though a General Council be the Church representative, and do not meet, or assemble together hic & nunc, but by order and deputation from man; yet it follows not, but the Power and Authority by which they act when they are met may be from God, as doubtless it is. Can any Man have the face to question, Whether the Authority of general Councils be of Divine Institution or no, when you say, Yes surely, there is no doubt to be made of it, doubtless it is? We do not question, as you would seem to imply afterwards, Whether the People or the Pastours have right to send to general Councils, but what ground you have to assert, that general Councils are an immediate Divine Institution. But I must needs say, I never saw any thing affirmed oftner, and offered to be proved less, than that is here; and yet as though you had done it invincibly you triumphantly proceed; General Councils then, are a principal and necessary part of that Ecclesiastical Hierarchy which Christ instituted for the Government of his Church, and not an humane Expedient only, taken up by the Church her self meerly upon prudential Considerations, as the Bishop will needs conceive. It strangely puzzles me to find out any thing that Particle then relates to; and after all my search can find nothing, but surely, without doubt, and doubtless. I pray Sir, think not so meanly of us, that we should take these for Arguments or Demonstrations: Deal fairly with us, and if we fall by the force of Reason, we yield our selves up to you. But you are very much deceived, if you think these things are taken for Proofs with us: we can easily discern the weakness of your Cause through the most confident Affirmations. If you had brought any Law of Christ, appointing that general Councils should be in the Church, any Apostolical Precept, prescribing or giving Directions concerning them, you had done something; but, not so much as to offer at a Proof, and yet conclude it as confidently as if it were impossible to resist the force of your Demonstrations, is an Evidence, that either you know your Cause to be weak, or suppose us to be so. Much such another Discourse is that which follows, wherein you pretend to give a Reason, Why what is defined by one Council in point of Doctrine, cannot be reversed by another. Which is, because the true Christian Faith is ex natura rei unchangeable, that it admits not of yea and nay, but only yea; that it is always the same, that it must stand without Alteration for ever, nay, that it is to be invariable and admit no change. All these Expressions we have in one Paragraph, and, for all that I see, are the greatest Strength of it. But what is it you mean by all this? Do you think we could not understand what you meant by the unchangeableness of Christian Faith, without so many diversified Expressions of it? And what follows now from all this? That one Council cannot repeal the Decrees of another? How so? was not the Faith of Christ as unchangeable in the time of the Arrian Councils, as it is now? And yet then one Council repealed the Decrees of others, in point of Doctrine; and yet by that nothing was derogated from the Institution or Honour of

Christ, by such a reversing those Decrees. Though the Faith, i. e. The Doctrine of Christ, be always the same, Doth it thence follow, then Men shall always believe all this unalterable Doctrine? If so, how came *Arrianism* to overspread the Church? How came six hundred Bishops at the Council of *Ariminum* to be deceived in a Doctrine of Faith, by your own Confession? It is therefore a profound mistake, to infer from the Fallibility of General Councils, the Alteration of the Faith of Christ. The Faith of Christ is founded on a surer bottom than the Decrees of Councils, though all Men are Liars God is true, and Christ the same Yesterday, to Day, and for Ever. But of this more afterwards.

§. 10.
P. 274, 275.

P. 261.

You would seem to argue more pertinently in the following Pages against his Lordship's Opinion: for you say, *He says and unsays the same; and what he seems to attribute to General Councils in one Proposition, he takes away in another.* That which his Lordship says, is, *That the Definitions of a General Council are binding to all Particulars, and it self; but yet so, that they cannot bind the whole Church from calling again, and in the after calls upon just cause to order, and, if need be, to abrogate former Acts.* And after adds, *And because the whole Church can meet no other way, the Council shall remain the Supream, external, living, temporary Ecclesiastical Judge of all Controversies. Only the whole Church, and she alone, hath Power when Scripture or Demonstration is found, and peaceably tendered to her, to represent her self again in a new Council, and in it to order what was amiss.* Now we must consider what we find Contradictious and repugnant to themselves in these Words: Three things, if I mistake not, the main of this Charge may be reduced to, 1. *That Men should be bound to that which Scripture and Demonstration be against;* But this is very easily answered, for his Lordship doth not say, Men are bound to believe it, but not so to oppose it as to break the Peace of the Church by it. 2. *That another Council cannot be call'd without Opposition to the other:* This his Lordship prevented, by supposing that the just Reasons against the Decrees of the former Council ought to be peaceably tendred to the Church; but no boisterous Opposition to be made against it. 3. *To what purpose should another Council be called, if the whole Church be satisfied that there is Scripture and Demonstration against the Decrees of the former?* But, 1. His Lordship supposes there may Scripture and Demonstration be, where the whole Church is not satisfied; and therefore there may be necessity of calling another Council. 2. That the Council may free all those who may suppose themselves still bound not to oppose the former Error. 3. That no erroneous Decree of a Council, may remain unrepealed in the Church: that so no erroneous Person may challenge such a Decree of a Council, as a ground for his Opposition to the Doctrine of the Church. And where now lies any such Appearance of Contradiction in his Lordship's Words?

§. 11.
P. 262.

P. 275.

3. The last thing his Lordship chargeth your way with unreasonableness in, is, *That you do not only make the Definition of a General Council, but the Sentence of the Pope Infallible; nay, more Infallible than it.* For, any General Council may err with you, if the Pope confirm it not. So belike this Infallibility rests not in the representative Body, the Council, nor in the whole Body the Church, but in your Head of the Church, the Pope of Rome. And if this be so, To what end such a trouble for a General Council? or, Wherein are we nearer to Unity, if the Pope confirm it not? To this you answer, 1. *That a General Council is not held by you to be Infallible at all, unless it involve the Pope, or his Confirmation; and so there is but one Infallibility, viz. of the Pope presiding in, and confirming of the Votes of a General Council.* 2. *You confess there are two different Opinions among you; the first and more common is, that the Pope, even*

without

without a General Council, is Infallible in his Definitions of Faith, when he teaches the whole Church; the second is, that he is not Infallible in his Definitions, save only were he defines in, and with, a General Council. Now the Bishop (you say) takes no notice of the second Opinion, but only of the first, as though that were the Opinion of all Catholick Doctors. But, for your part, you will not meddle much with any matters of private Opinion or Dispute, and therefore you will briefly pass over what his Lordship saith further, and only correct some Mistakes of his. But whereas you pretend it only necessary to believe, that Pope and Council together are Infallible, for this all Catholicks are agreed in; but, whether the Pope be Infallible without a Council or no, you leave it as matter of Dispute. I shall manifest, how great a Cheat you put upon the World by this Assertion, in these two Things, 1. That there is no such Agreement among your selves in this common Principle, as you pretend. 2. That from the making the Pope's Confirmation necessary to the Infallibility of the Council, you must make the Pope Infallible without a Council. 1. Whereas you pretend such a consent among all Catholicks in this common Principle, That Pope and Council are Infallible together, it is evident that there is no such thing. For, 1. Some among you have asserted, that the representative Body of the Church is not at all the Subject of Infallibility, but the diffusive. For Occham contends at large, That the Privilege of Infallibility, belongs only to the whole Mitant Church; and neither to the Pope, nor General Council, nor body of the Clergy. And so likewise doth Petrus de Alliaco, Cusanus, Antoninus of Florence, Panormitan, Nicolaus de Clemangis, Franciscus Mirandula, and others, whose Words you may find at large in some of your Writers, and therefore I forbear repeating them. 2. Some assert, that Councils are no further Infallible, than they adhere to Universal Tradition; and you cannot be ignorant, who they are at this Day among you, who assert this Doctrine. 3. Some further say, That Councils are in themselves Infallible, and therefore must be so, whether the Pope confirm them or no. And this Opinion, however now you say, it be not so common as the other, yet it is certain, that before the Council of Lateran under Leo 10. it was much the more common Opinion, as appears by the Councils of Constance and Basil. And, that there is an irreconcilable Difference between the Authors of this Opinion, and those who make the Pope's Confirmation necessary to the Infallibility of a General Council, I shall prove out of Bellarmin himself, from the state of the Question, and the Arguments he urges against it. Bellarmin tells us, The first occasion of this Controversie, was about the Deposition of Popes, viz. whether the Pope might against his consent be judged, condemned, and deposed by the Council: and therefore, saith he, They are mistaken, who think the Question is, Whether the Council with the Pope be greater than the Pope without a Council? for, it cannot be conceived he should give consent to his own Deposition. And this he proves from the Council at Basil, who defined their Council to be above the Pope, at that time, when neither the Pope nor his Legates were present. And this Council of Basil in their Synodal Epistle, declare a General Council, as representing the Universal Church to be Infallible, when at the same time they assert, That Popes have fallen into Heresie. Now, Can any one possibly imagine, these Men should believe the Pope's Confirmation to be necessary to the Council's Infallibility, who suppose the Pope may be an Heretick at the same time, in which a Council may be Infallible? And when they assert it to belong to the Council only to pronounce, Whether the Pope be guilty of Heresie or no? Those therefore

Occham Dialog. p. 1. l. 5. cap. 25, 29, 31.
Cameracensis quest. Vesp. art. 3. ad liter.
O & P.
Cusan. Concord. Cathol. l. 2. c. 3.
Antonin. Summ. Summarum, p. 3. Tit.
23. c. 2. sect. 6.
Panormitan. decret. p. 1. l. 1. Tit. de elect.
cap. significasti.
Clemangis disput. de Concil. Gener.
Mirandula de fide & ordine credend. [Theo-
rem. 4. &c.

Bellarmin. de
Concil. l. 2.
c. 13.

De Concil. l. 2.
c. 14.

c. 16.

therefore who contend for the *Council's Authority* above the *Pope*, do not at all look at the *Pope's Confirmation*, as necessary to make the *Decrees Infallible*; though some of them may, to make *Canonical*. For there lies one of your Fallacies; because they look on the *Pope* as *Ministerial Head* of the *Church*, therefore to make *Canons* to be valid, they may judge it in most cases necessary that the *Pope* confirm the *Decrees*; but yet, they do not suppose this *Confirmation* doth at all make them *Infallible*; but, whether the *Pope* had confirmed them or no, they had been *Infallible* however. So that you cannot say, *That it is a Principle of Faith among you, that Pope and Council together are Infallible*; for those of this Opinion make it a *Principle of Faith*, that the *Council* in it self is *Infallible*, and consequently, whether it be confirmed by the *Pope* or no. And therefore *Bellarmin* saith, Their Opinion is, *That in case the Pope be dead, deposed, or refuseth to come to the Council, the Council is not at all the less perfect, but that it hath full Power to make Definitions in matters of Faith*. And when he comes to urge against this Opinion, one of his Arguments is, that from hence it follows, *That the Council would not at all need the Pope's Confirmation*; and another, *That Councils without the Pope may err in Decrees of Faith*; for which he instanceth in the *Councils of Sirmium, Milan, Ariminum, Ephesus, &c.* Neither, saith he, can it be answered, that these *Councils* erred, because they were *unlawful Councils*; for the most of them wanted nothing but the *Pope's consent*, and the second *Ephesine Council* was just such another as that of *Basil*. From which Disputation of *Bellarmin*, it is both clear, that those who make *Councils* above the *Pope*, do not judge the *Pope's Confirmation* necessary; and those who judge it necessary, do not suppose the *Council* *Infallible* without it. So that you are either deceived your self, or would deceive others, when you would make them believe that there is but one *Infallibility* asserted by you, whereas nothing can be more evident, than that two distinct *Subjects of Infallibility* are asserted in your *Church*, some placing it in the *Council* without the *Pope*, and others in the *Pope*, and not in the *Council*, and neither of them absolutely and formally in the *Pope and Council* together.

¶ 12.

L. 2. de Concil.
c. 11.

[P. 266.

2. I shall therefore more fully shew, *That those who make the Pope's Confirmation necessary, do really place the Infallibility in the Pope, and not in the Council*; and that from these things, 1. Because they in Terms assert, *That though nothing be wanting to a Council, but the Pope's Confirmation, it may err, if the Pope confirm it not*. And this we produced *Bellarmin's* Assertion for already, giving that as the only reason, why those *Councils* did err, which wanted nothing but that. Nay, he elsewhere asserts, *Not only that General Councils may err, though the Pope confirm them not, but although the Pope's Legates be present, and consent with the Council, yet if they do not follow the certain Instruction of the Pope, the Council may err*. And; Can any one then possibly conceive, that the *Infallibility* lies any where but in the *Pope*? 2. You assert, *That all the Power and Infallibility which is in the Church, is formally in the Pope, and only finally in the Church, because it is for the good of the Church*; this I suppose you have not forgot, since you told us, that *S. Peter sustained the Person of the Church* historic, and not parabolice, and that the fulness of all *Ecclesiastical Power* was in him as *Head of the Church*: If this be true, as there you assert it confidently, whatever you pretend here, you are bound to defend, that all the *Infallibility* in the *Council* comes wholly from the *Pope*; for I know you will not place *Infallibility* in one, and the fulness of *Ecclesiastical Power* in another. 3. Because the main ground of the reprobating *Councils* lies in the *Pope's dissent*. So that *Councils* which in all other Particulars are accounted lawful and general,

general, yet if any thing passed displeasing in them to the Pope, so far they are reprobated; as the Proceedings of the Council of Chalcedon, Constance, and Basil, in reference to the Popes, do sufficiently testify. For, although they were the same Persons, acting with equal Freedom in those, as in other things, yet when they came to touch any thing of the Pope's Interest, then, because the Pope doth not consent, so far they were not Infallible. By which it is plain, that, though the Council stands for a shew and blind to the World, all the Infallibility lies wholly in the Pope. And by this means, to be sure, the Pope shall never receive any hurt by General Councils; for if he pleases, the Council shall either be approved or rejected, or partly approved, and partly rejected; or neither approved, nor rejected; for of all these sorts Bellarmine tells us Councils are: which in short is, The Councils which make for the Pope's turn, are Infallible, but none other. And therefore Bellarmine, very consonantly to his Principles, says expressly, *Totam firmitatem Conciliorum legitimum esse à Pontifice, non partim à Pontifice, partim à Concilio*; The whole strength of lawful Councils depends wholly on the Pope, and not partly on the Pope, and partly on the Council. And if their Firmness doth, their Infallibility must do so too. This is not a meer private Opinion of his, but that which doth necessarily follow, from the making the Pope's Confirmation necessary to the Infallibility of General Councils. Although therefore you would fain put off this as a matter of Dispute among your selves; yet it can be no matter of Dispute any more, than, Whether the Decrees of Councils, as confirmed by the Pope, be Infallible or no? And therefore all that his Lordship objects, falls upon all such who assert this: Whereof the first which you mention is, That then the Council is called but only in effect, to hear the Pope give his Sentence in more State. To which you answer, That the Objection hath the same Force against the Council called in the Apostles time, viz. that it was done, only to hear S. Peter pronounce his Sentence in more State. Neither had it been any more, if the Infallibility of the Council had only depended on S. Peter's Sentence; but I hope you will not deny the rest of the Apostles to have been as Infallible as S. Peter was. But you answer, 2. That the Pope being to use all means morally requisite to find out the Truth; the Council is called really to help and assist the Pope; and the Advice of the Council is a necessary Medium to his Holiness, whereby to make a full Inspection into the Matters he is to define. But all this only confirms what his Lordship saith, That it is for his giving Sentence in more State; for the Council is only a subservient Means, and contributes nothing at all to the Infallibility of the Sentence. But, you say, They are a necessary Medium. 1. Then the Pope cannot define any matter of Faith without a General Council. Which, all who assert that Opinion, utterly deny; for they say, The Pope may define Matters of Faith without a General Council; and Bellarmine saith, That the State of the Church, without General Councils (which was for three hundred Years) might have continued so to the World's End; and therefore it was necessary there should be a living Judge, whose Infallibility should not depend upon any Council: And elsewhere he says, That if seven Heresies have been condemned by seven General Councils; more than a Hundred have been condemned without, by the Pope and Provincial Councils. 2. Though the Pope must use all moral Means, yet, Why must a General Council be that necessary Medium? Why may not a Provincial, or lesser Council serve turn? And so Bellarmine tells you, it would; he saith, indeed some kind of Council is necessary, magnum aut parvum, unum vel plura, prout ipse judicaverit, great or little, more or less, as the Pope shall judge fitting; so that still a General Council is but a piece of State, for all moral means might be used without one. 3. What use are these moral Means for? to enable

De Pontif.
Rom. l. 4. c. 3.

Ibid:

De Rom. Pont.
l. 4. c. 3.De Concil. l. 1.
c. 10.

Ibid. c. 11.

Journal of
Mr. de Saint
Amour. part. 3.
chap. 4. p. 78.

Journal. part
3. chap. 12.
p. 120.

P. 277.

Ibid.

§. 13.
P. 278.

enable him to pass a right Judgment, or no? If they be, then the Pope is bound to pronounce according to the Decree of the Council, and so it will not be in his Power, not to confirm it; if not, What do these moral Means signifie? No more, than the *Crucifix Pope Innocent* shewed to *Monsieur de Saint-Amour*; Before which, he told him, he kneeled down to take at the feet thereof his Resolution, according to the Inspiration given to him by the Holy Spirit, whose Assistance was promised to him, and could not fail him. We see, the Pope understood his *Infallibility* better, than to make use of such moral Means, as Councils are; he knew his *Infallibility* came not that way, and therefore he took the more likely Course to receive his *Inspiration* from Heaven, by taking his Resolution at the feet of a *Crucifix*. And this he called, his Council in matters of Faith: And yet, if we believe him, he did as much want all moral means for finding out the Truth, as another; since he so ingenuously confessed at another Audience, That he was old and had never studied Divinity. But, What need he to do it, that could so easily be inspired, by kneeling at the feet of a *Crucifix*? Your Doctrine then would not be very well taken at Rome, that general Councils are a necessary Medium to his Holiness, in order to the Definition of Matters of Faith. No more would your following Distinction in Vindication of Stapleton, That though the Pope acquires no new Power, or certainty of Judgment by the Presence of a General Council, yet there is something thereby, which conduceth to the due Exercise of that Power: So that it must be an Usurpation or undue Exercise of Power, for the Pope to offer to define without a general Council. I know not what Liberty you have to write these things among us; but if you were at Rome, you durst not venture to do it. Your saying, that Bellarmine only says, That the firmness of a Council in regard of us, depends wholly on the Pope's Confirmation, argues, you had very little to say: For, What firmness hath a Council at all in this Dispute, but in regard of us; since you look on Men as obliged to believe the Decrees of it Infallible? And if the Decrees had any *Infallibility* from the Council, that might make them firm in regard of us, as well as the Pope. But you object to your self, That if the Pope be Infallible without the Council, and the Council subject to Error without the Pope, it must needs follow, that all the *Infallibility* of General Councils proceeds from the Pope only; not partly from the Pope, and partly from the Council. To which you answer, That the Assertors of that Opinion (of whom you must be one, if you know what you say) may say, that Christ hath made two Promises to his Church, the one to assist her Sovereign Head and Pastor to make him Infallible, another to assist general Councils to make them so. But, What need this latter, if the former be well proved? For if the Head be Infallible by Virtue of a Promise from Christ, he must be Infallible, whether in Council, or out of it. And therefore it is a ridiculous Shift to say, The Pope hath one Promise to make him Infallible in a General Council; another to make him so out of it. But I commend you, that since you thought one would not hold, you would have two Strings for the Pope's Infallibility. And it is but adding a third Promise to the Church in general, and then your threefold Cord may be surely Infallible.

You give many Reasons (but none so convincing as Experience) Why the Pope's should not be Impeccable; and, if you search Scripture, Antiquity, and Reason, you may find as much, why they should not be Infallible. For that of the necessity of one, and not the other for the Church, is of your own devising, it having been sufficiently proved, that the Certainty of Faith doth not at all depend upon the Popes, or your Churches, or Council's Infallibility. And it seems still very strange to all who know the Doctrine and Promises of Christianity, and that the Promotion of Holiness is the great Design

design of it, and that *Faith* signifies nothing without *Obedience*, and that the *Spirit of God* is a *Spirit of Holiness*, as well as *Truth*, that you dare challenge such an assistance of the *Divine Spirit*, as may make your *Popes* *Infallible*, who have led *Lives* quite contrary to the *Gospel of Christ*. Nay, such *Lives*, as his Lordship saith, as no *Epicurean Monster*, storied out to the *World*, hath out-gone them in *Sensuality*, or other gross *Impiety*, if their own *Historians* be true.

P. 263.

Your Vindication of *Pope Liberius* his submitting his Judgment to *Athanasius*, because the *Pope* had passed no *Definition ex Cathedra* in the *Business*, hath no Strength at all, unless you first prove, that the *Pope's Definitions ex Cathedra*, were held *Infallible* then, which none would ever believe that read the Passage, which his Lordship cites out of *Liberius* his *Epistles* to *Athanasius*. For, as he saith, The *Pope* complemented exceeding low, that would submit his unerring Judgment, to be commanded by *Athanasius*, who he well knew could err. Whether *S. Ambrose* in his *Epistle* meddles with any doctrinal *Definitions*, or only with some *Difficulties* which that Year happened about the *Observation of Easter*, (the fourteenth of the first Month, falling on the *Lord's Day*) is not very material to our purpose. But that it was something else besides *Astronomical Definitions* (which I know not what *S. Ambrose's* Excellency was in) might easily appear, if you had read the *Epistle*. So that you might have spared your large Account of the *Paschal Letters*, sent by the *Bishops of Alexandria* about the keeping of *Easter* (which are no great *Novelties* to such, who are at all acquainted with *Antiquity*) and given us a fuller Account, why in such a matter of *Dispute* about the right of the *Day* to be kept that Year, the *Roman Bishops* should not rather have stood to the *Pope's Definition*, than write to *S. Ambrose*, if it had been then taken for granted, that the *Pope* was *Infallible*. But I might as well have passed by this Testimony of *S. Ambrose*, as you do that of *Lyra*, which is so expresse for the Erring and *Apostatizing* of several *Popes*, that you thought the best Answer to it, were to let it alone. However you come off with the Story of *Peter Lombard* (which is not of that Consequence to require any further Examination of the Truth of it) I am sure you are hard put to it, in the case of *Honorius*; when you deny, that *Honorius* did really maintain the *Monothelites Heresie*, and excuse the *Councils Sentence*, by saying, it was only in case of *Mis-information*. Since it manifestly appears by the sixth *Synod*, *Action. 13.* that they condemned his *Epistle* written to *Sergius*, as containing heretical and pernicious Doctrine in it. And in the seventh *Synod* he is reckoned up with *Arrius*, *Macedonius*, *Eutyches*, *Dioscorus*, and the rest of condemned *Hereticks*, among whom he is likewise reckoned by *Leo 2.* in his *Epistle* to *Constantine*. Which Evidence is so great, that *Canus* wonders at those who would offer to vindicate him. And, in the mean time, you provide excellent moral means for the *Pope* to judge of matters of Faith by, in *General Councils*, if they may be guilty of so gross *mis-information*, as you suppose here in the case of *Honorius*; and not one barely, but three successively, the sixth, seventh, and eighth, and the whole Church from their time: till *Albertus Pighius*, who first began to defend him. For conclusion of this Point, his Lordship would fain know (since this had been so plain, so easie a way, either to prevent all Divisions about the Faith, or to end all Controversies, did they arise) why this brief, but most necessary Proposition, The Bishop of Rome cannot err in his judicial Determinations concerning Faith, is not to be found either in Letter or Sense, in any Scripture, in any Council, or in any Father of the Church, for the full space of a Thousand Years and more after Christ? To this you answer, 1. That in the Sense wherein

Ibid.

P. 264.

Ambros. l. 10. ep. 83.

P. 280.

Action. 8. Synod. 6. Canus, l. 6. Cap. ult.

P. 267.

Ibid.

Catholicks maintain the Pope's Infallibility to be a matter of necessary Belief to all Christians it is found (for Sense) both in Scripture, Councils, and Fathers, as you say you have proved, in proving the Infallibility of General Councils, of which he is the most principal and necessary Member. So then, when we enquire for the Infallibility of General Councils, we are sent to the Pope for his Confirmation to make them so; but when we enquire for the Pope's Infallibility, we are sent back again to the Councils, for the Proof of it. And they are hugely to blame, if they give not an ample Testimony to the Pope, since he can do them as good a turn. But, between them both, we see the greatest Reason to believe neither the one, nor the other to be Infallible. But, 2. You would offer at something too for his *Personal Infallibility*; in which I highly commend your Prudence, that you say, *You will omit Scripture*; and you might as well have omitted all that follows, since you say only, *That the Testimonies you have produced, seem to do it in effect*; and at last say, *That it is an Assertion you have wholly declined the maintaining of, and judge it expedient to do so still*. And you may very well do so, if there be no better Proofs for it than those you have produced, but however, we must examine them. Doth not the Council of Chalcedon seem to say, in effect, that the Pope is Infallible, when, upon the reading of his Epistle to them, in Condemnation of the Eutychian Heresie, the whole Assembly of Prelates cry out with Acclamation, and profess that S. Peter (who was Infallible) spake by the Mouth of Leo, and that the Pope was Interpreter of the Apostle's Voice? You do well to use those cautious Expressions of *seeming to say in effect*, for it would be a very hard matter to imagine any such thing as the Pope's Infallibility in the highest Expressions used by the Council of Chalcedon. For, after the reading of Leo's Epistle against Eutyches, and many Testimonies of the Fathers to the same Purpose, the Council begins their Acclamations, with these Words, *This is the Faith of the Fathers, this is the Faith of the Apostles; all who are orthodox hold thus*. And after it follows, *Peter by Leo hath thus spoken, the Apostles have taught thus*. Which are all the Words there extant to that purpose. And, Is not this a stout Argument, for the Pope's *Personal Infallibility*? For, What else do they mean, but only that Leo, who succeeded in the Apostolical See of S. Peter at Rome, did concur in Faith with S. Peter, and the rest of the Apostles? But, Do they say, that it was impossible that Leo should err, or that his Judgement was Infallible? or only that he owned that Doctrine which was Divine and Apostolical? And the Council of Ephesus (your next Testimony) hath much less than this, even nothing at all. For the Council speaks not concerning S. Peter, or the Pope in the place by you cited; only one of the Pope's officious Legates, Philip, begins very formally, with S. Peter's being Prince and Head of the Apostles, &c. and that he to this Day *ἐν τοῖς αὐτοῖς διαδόχοις ᾧ καὶ ἀνδρὶ*; lives in his Successors, and passeth Judgement. Is it not a very good Inference from hence, that the Council acknowledged the Pope's *Personal Infallibility*? Because one of the Pope's Legates did assert in the Council, that S. Peter lived and judged by the Pope. And yet, Might not this be done without his *Personal Infallibility*, in regard of his Succession in that See which was founded by S. Peter? But you are very hard driven, when you are fain to take up with the Sentence of a Roman Priest, instead of a General Council, and any Judgement in matters of Faith, instead of Infallibility. Your other Testimonies of S. Hierom, S. Augustine, and S. Cyprian, have been largely examined already; and for the remaining Testimonies of four Popes, you justly fear it would be answered, that they were Popes, and spake partially in their own Cause. And you give us no antidote against these Fears; but conclude very warily, *That you had*

Ibid.

Council. Chalced.
part. 2. Act. 2.
p. 228.

Council. Ephes.
p. 2. Act. 3. p.
330.

P. 281.

had hitherto declined the defence of that Assertion, and professed that it would be sufficient for Protestants to acknowledge the Pope Infallible in, and with General Councils only. But, as we see no Reason to believe General Councils at all Infallible, whether with, or without the Pope; so neither can we see, but if the Infallibility of the Council depends on the Pope's Confirmation, you are bound to defend the Pope's Personal Infallibility, as the main Bulwark of your Church.

C H A P. III.

Of the Errors of Pretended General Councils.

110:1.M.

The erroneous Doctrine of the Church of Rome in making the Priests Intention necessary to the Essence of Sacraments. That Principle destructive to all Certainty of Faith upon our Author's Grounds. The Absurdity of asserting that Councils define themselves to be Infallible. Sacramental Actions sufficiently distinguished from others without the Priest's Intention. Of the moral Assurance of the Priest's Intention, and the Insufficiency of a meer virtual Intention. The Pope's Confirmation of Councils supposeth Personal Infallibility. Transubstantiation an Error decreed by Pope and Council. The Repugnancy of it to the Grounds of Faith. The Testimonies brought for it out of Antiquity examined at large, and shewed to be far from proving Transubstantiation. Communion in one kind a Violation of Christ's Institution. The Decree of the Council of Constance implies a non obstante to it. The unalterable Nature of Christ's Institution cleared. The several Evasions considered and answered. No publick Communion in one kind for a Thousand Tears after Christ. The Indispensableness of Christ's Institution owned by the Primitive Church. Of Invocation of Saints, and the Rhetorical Expressions of the Fathers which gave occasion to it. No Footsteps of the Invocation of Saints in the three first Centuries; nor Precept or Example in Scripture as our Adversaries confess. Evidences against Invocation of Saints from the Christians Answers to the Heathens. The Worship of Spirits and Heroes among the Heathens justifiable on the same Grounds that Invocation of Saints is in the Church of Rome. Commemoration of the Saints without Invocation, in S. Augustin's time. Invocation of Saints as practised in the Church of Rome, a Derogation to the Merits of Christ. Of the Worship of Images, and the near approach to Pagan Idolatry therein. No Use or Veneration of Images in the Primitive Church. The Church of Rome justly chargeable with the Abuses committed in the Worship of Images.

Although nothing can be more unreasonable than to pretend that Church, Person, or Council to be Infallible, which we can prove to have actually erred; yet we have yielded so much to you, as to disprove what you have in general brought for the one, before we come to meddle with the other. But that being dispatched, we come to a more short and compendious way of overthrowing your Infallibility, by shewing the palpable Falsity of such Principles which must be owned by you as Infallible Truths, because defined by General Councils confirmed by the Pope. Whereof, the first in the Endicment, as you say, is that of the Priest's Intention defined by the Councils of Florence and Trent (both of them confirmed by the Pope) to be essentially necessary to the Validity of a Sacrament. Concerning this, there are two

Q. 1.

P. 281.

things to be enquired into, 1. *Whether this doth not render all Pretence of Infallibility with you a vain and useless thing?* 2. *Whether it be not in it self an Error?*

P. 271.

We must begin with the *first* of these, for that was the Occasion of his Lordship's entring upon it; for he was shewing, *That your claim of Infallibility is of no use at all, for the settling of Truth and Peace in the Church; because no Man can either know or believe this Infallibility. It cannot be believed with Divine Faith; having no Foundation either in the written Word of God, or Tradition of the Catholick Church; and no humane Faith can be sufficient in order to it. But neither can it be believed or known, upon that Decree of the Councils of Florence and Trent, that the Intention of the Priest is necessary to the Validity of a Sacrament. And lest you should think I represent his Lordship's Words too much with Advantage, I will take his Argument in the Words you have summed it up in, which are these: Before the Church or any particular Man can make use of the Pope's Infallibility (that is, be settled, and confirmed in the Truth by means thereof) he must either know, or upon sure Grounds believe, that he is Infallible. But (says the Bishop) this can only be believed of him, as he is S. Peter's Successor and Bishop of Rome; of which it is impossible, in the Relator's Opinion, for the Church or any particular Man, to have such Certainty, as is sufficient to ground an Infallible Belief. Why? Because the Knowledge and Belief of this, depends upon his being truly in Orders, truly a Bishop, truly a Priest, truly Baptized; none of all which, according to our Principles, can be certainly known and believed; because (forsooth) the Intention of him that administred these Sacraments to the Pope, or made him Bishop, Priest, &c. can never be certainly known; and yet by the Doctrine of the Councils of Florence and Trent, it is of absolute necessity to the Validity of every one of these Sacraments, so as without it, the Pope were neither Bishop nor Priest. Thus I grant you have faithfully summ'd up his Lordship's Argument; we must now see with what Courage and Success you encounter it. Your first Answer is, That though it be level'd against the Pope's Infallibility, yet it hath the same Force against the Infallibility of the whole Church in Points Fundamental; for we cannot be Infallibly sure, there is such a Number of Baptized Persons to make a Church. By this, we see how likely you are to alloil this Difficulty, who bring it more strongly upon your self, without the least Inconvenience to your Adversary. For I grant, it necessarily follows against the Pretence of any Infallibility, whether in Church, Councils, or Pope, as being a certain ground for Faith; for all these must suppose such a Certainty of the due Administration of Sacraments, which your Doctrine of Intention doth utterly destroy. For these two things are your Principles of Faith, that there can be no certainty of Faith, without present Infallibility of the Church; and that, in order to the believing this Testimony Infallible, there must be such a certainty as is ground sufficient for an Infallible Belief. Now, How is it possible there can be such, when there can be no certainty of the Being of a Church, Council, or Pope, from your own Principles? For when the only way of knowing this, is a thing not possible to be evidenced to any one in any way of Infallible certainty, viz. the Intention of the Priest, you must unavoidably destroy all your Pretence of Infallibility. For, To what purpose do you tell me, that Pope or Councils are Infallible, unless I may be Infallibly sure that such Decrees were passed by Pope and Council? I cannot be assured of that, unless I be first assured that they were Baptized Persons, and Bishops of the Church; and for this you dare not offer at Infallible certainty, and therefore all the rest is useless and vain. So that while by this Doctrine of the Intention of the Priest for the Validity of the Sacraments, you thought to advance higher the Reputation of the Priesthood, and to take away the Assurance of Protestants,*

Protestants, as to the Benefits which come by the use of the *Sacraments* of *Baptism* and the *Lord's Supper*, you could not have assured any thing more really pernicious to your selves, than this *Doctrine* is. So strange an *Inrogitancy* was it in those Councils to define it, and as great in those who defend it, and yet at the same time, maintain the Necessity of a present *Infallibility* in the Church and general Councils. For can any thing be more rational, than to desire the highest Assurance as to that, whose *Decrees* I am to believe *Infallible*? And yet at the last, you confess we can have but a moral Certainty of it, and that of the lowest degree; the utmost ground of it, being either the Testimony of the *Priest* himself, or, that we have no ground to suspect the contrary. Now what unreasonable Men are you, who so much to the Dishonour of *Christian Religion* cry out upon the rational Evidence of the Truth of it, as an uncertain Principle, and that *Protestants* though they assert the highest Degree of actual Certainty, cannot have any *Divine Faith*, because they want the Churches infallible Testimony? And yet when we enquire into this *Infallible Testimony*, you are fain to resolve it, into one of the most uncertain and conjectural things imaginable. For what can I have less ground to build my Faith upon, than that the *Priest* had at least a virtual Intention to do as the Church doth? Whom must I believe in this Case? And whereon must that Faith be grounded? On the *Priests Testimony*? But how can I be assured, but that he, who may wander in his Intention, may do so in his Expression too? Or must I do it because I have no reason to suspect the contrary? how can you assure me of that, that I have no reason to suspect the contrary? no otherwise than by telling me, that the *Priest* is a Man of that Honesty and Integrity, that he cannot be supposed to do such a thing without Intention? So that, though I were in *Italy* or *Spain*, where, some have told us, it is no hard Matter to meet with *Jews* in *Priests Habits*, and professing themselves such, and acting accordingly; yet I am bound to believe (though) they heartily believe nothing of *Christianity* that in all *Sacraments* they must have an Intention to do as the Church doth. Without which, we are told by you, No Sacrament can be valid, because the Matter and Form cannot be determined or united without the *Priest's Intention*. And therefore I do not only Object, that this takes away the Comfort of all *Sacraments* as to the Receivers, but that it destroys all certain Foundations of Faith. Because the Promises of *Infallibility* supposing that, which I can have no assurance of, that *Infallibility* can be no Foundation of Faith at all to me. As for Instance, Suppose the Title to an Estate depends upon the King's free Donation, and this Donation to be confirmed by his great Seal; but yet so, that if the Lord Chancellor in the sealing it, doth not intend it should pass on that Account, the whole Gift becomes null in Law. I pray tell me now, What other Assurance you can have of your Title to this Estate, than you have of the Lord Chancellor's Intention in passing the Seal? And what *Infallible Certainty* you can have of such Intention of his? Just such is your Case, you tell us, The only Ground of *Infallible Certainty* in Faith is the Churches *Infallibility*, this *Infallibility* comes by a free Promise of Christ, this Promise must suppose a Church in being; that there is a Church, we can have no more Assurance than that there are Baptized Persons, but the Validity of their Baptism requires the *Priest's Intention* in administering it; and therefore we can have no more Assurance of the Churches *Infallibility*, than we have of the *Priest's Intention*. And, is this it at last, which your loud Clamours of *Infallibility* come to? Is this the Effect of all your Exclamations against *Protestants*, for making Faith uncertain by taking away the Church's *Infallibility*? Must our Faith at last be resolved into that, which it is impossible

possible we should have any undoubted *Assurance* at all of? And will not the highest Reason, the clearest Evidence, the most pregnant Demonstrations which things are capable of, be accounted with you *sufficient Ground* to build our *Faith* of the *Scriptures* upon? And yet, must a thing so *impossible* to be *certainly* known, so generally uncertain and conjectural, be accounted by you *sufficient Ground* to believe your *Churches Infallibility*? Are not the *Miracles* wrought by *Christ* and his *Apostles*, joyned with the *Universal Tradition* of the Christian Church, a ground firm enough, for us to believe the *Doctrine* of *Christ* divine? And yet must the *Intention* of the *Priest* with you be a much surer Ground than these are? By all which it appears, that if I had not already largely discovered your grand *Imposture* in your Pretence to *Infallibility*, this very *Doctrine* would invincibly prove it; since, notwithstanding that Pretence, you must resolve all into something which falls short of those Grounds of *Certainty* which we have to build our *Faith* upon. But we must now consider, how you offer to retort this upon his Lordship; for you say, *The same Argument will hold against the Infallibility of the whole Church in Fundamentals; since Men cannot be Infallibly sure, there is such a Company of Men who are truly Baptized.* But how manifestly ridiculous this is, will appear, 1. That it will hold indeed against all such who assert this *Doctrine* of the necessity of the *Priest's Intention*, but not others. Therefore if his Lordship had said, This *Doctrine* had been true, the Retortion had been good; but you saw well enough he disproves it as an *Error*, and urges this as an Absurdity consequent upon it. Your Argument then as it is, runs in this Form: If they who hold the *Priest's Intention* necessary cannot be *sure* who are Baptized, then they who do not hold it necessary, cannot. Where is your Consequence? For he was shewing, the *uncertainty* of it depended upon that Principle, and therefore I suppose the denying of the Principle doth not stand guilty of the same Absurdity, which the holding it doth. But it may be, the Force lies in being *Infallibly sure*, and so that none can know the *Infallibility* of the Church in *Fundamentals*, but such as are *Infallibly sure* that Men are Baptized. I Answer therefore, 2. That there is no such necessity of being *Infallibly sure*, upon our Principles as there is upon yours. For you build your *Faith* upon the *Churches Infallibility* in *Pope* and *Councils*, but we do not pretend to build our *Faith* upon the *Church's Infallibility* in *Fundamentals*. All that we assert, is, that the *Church* is *Infallible* in *Fundamentals*; but we do not say, the ground of our *Faith* is, because she is so, for that were to make the *Church* the *formal Object* of our *Faith*: Since therefore we do not rely on the *Church* as our *Infallible Guide* in *Fundamentals*, there is no such Necessity of that *Infallible Certainty* as to this Principle as there is with you, who must wholly establish your *Faith* upon the *Churches Infallibility*. The most then that we assert, is, that there is and shall always be a *Church*, for that (as I have told you) is all that is meant by a *Church* being *Infallible* in *Fundamentals*; now for this we have the greatest Assurance possible, that there shall be from the Promises of *Christ*, and that *there is*, from the Certainty we have of the Faith and Baptism of *Christians*, since no more is required by us to assure Men of it, than all Men in the World are competent Judges of; which surely they cannot be of the *Priest's Intention*. So much for your weak Attempt of retorting this Argument upon his Lordship.

2. 2.
Ibid.

But the main thing to be considered, is, your solid Answer you give to it; which indeed is of that weight, that it must not be slightly passed over. You Answer therefore, *That both a General Council and the Pope, when they define any Matters of Faith, do also implicitly define that themselves*

are

are Infallible; and by Consequence that both the Pope in such Case, and also the Bishops that sit in Council are Persons Baptized, in holy Orders, and have all things essentially necessary for that Function, which they then execute. Neither is there any more Difficulty in the Case of the Pope now, than there was in the time of the Prophets and Apostles of old; whom all must grant that with the same Breath they defined, or Infallibly declared the several Articles and Points of Doctrine proposed by them to the Faithful, and their own Infallibility in proposing them. So indeed Vega answered in the Case of general Councils; for when it was demanded, How it should be known that the Council was a lawful Council, he says, *Because the Council defined it self to be so*; but for this he is sufficiently chastised by Bellarmine, who gives this unanswerable Argument against it. Either it doth appear from some other Argument, De Concil. l. 2. c. 9. that while the Council defines it self to be a lawful Council, it was a lawful Council; or it doth not: if it doth, To what Purpose doth it define it self to be a lawful Council? If it doth not, then we shall doubt of that Decree whereby it defines it self to be so: For if I doubt, whether the Council were lawful before that Decree; I doubt likewise, whether it might not err in passing that Decree. And therefore he grants, that no more than moral Certainty or historical Faith is requisite in order to it. Now this Argument of Bellarmine's holds with equal Strength (if not more) against you; for you derive the Lawfulness of the Council from its Infallibility, and that Infallibility from the Council's Definition. Thus therefore I argue: Either it doth not appear, that the Council was Infallible before that Definition, or doth it not. If it appears to be Infallible before, then its Infallibility is not known by that Definition: If it doth not, How can I know it to be Infallible by it? For as I doubt, whether it was Infallible before it, so I must doubt, whether it was Infallible in it: and consequently it is impossible I should believe it Infallible because it defines it self to be so. Neither do you at all save this, by calling it only an *implicite Definition*, for whether it be *implicite* or *explicite*, it is all one, since that Definition is made the Ground, why we must believe the Council to be Infallible. And of all Men in the World you seem the strangest in this, that you declaim with so much vehemency against those who believe the Scriptures to be Infallible for themselves; and yet assert that Pope and General Councils are to be believed Infallible, because they define themselves to be so. Than which no greater Absurdity can be well imagined. For they who assert that the Scriptures are to be believed for themselves, do not thereby mean that they are to be believed Infallible meerly because they say they are Infallible, but that out of the Scriptures such Arguments may be brought, as may sufficiently prove that they come from God. But when you say, that Pope and general Councils are to be believed Infallible, because of their *implicite Definition* that they are so, you can mean nothing else, but that they are Infallible, because they take upon them to be Infallible, for that is all I can understand by your *implicit Definition*; for if they should decree they were Infallible, that were an *explicit Definition*. But yet how should this *implicit Definition* be known? For it must be some way certainly known, or else we can never believe that they are Infallible upon that Account. Which way then must we understand that they *implicitly* define it? Is it by their Meeting, debating, decreeing Matters of Faith? That cannot be, for Councils have done all these which are acknowledged to have erred. Is it by Pope and Council joyning together? But how can that be, unless I know before, that, when Pope and Council joyn, they are Infallible? If this then be all the way to prove that Pope and Council are true Bishops because

because *Infallible*, and they are *Infallible* because they define themselves to be so; I see, there is an absolute Necessity of a man's putting out the Eye of his Reason, if ever he hopes to see *Pope and Councils Infallible*: But further yet, there is more Absurdity still (if more can be imagin'd) in this excellent Answer; for here is a new *Labyrinth* for our Author to sport himself in. For, we are to believe a *Council* to consist of lawful *Bishops* because they are *Infallible*, and yet his only way to prove them *Infallible*, is by supposing that they consist of lawful *Bishops*. For I ask, Whether all Persons meeting together in *Council* are *Infallible*? No. Are all *Bishops* of *Protestant*, and the *Greek*, and other *Churches* besides the *Roman*, assembled in *Council* *Infallible*? No. Must it not then be supposed, that the *Bishops* are lawful *Bishops*, before they can implicitly define themselves *Infallible*? And if their Lawfulness must be supposed before their *Infallibility*, they cannot first be proved to be *Infallible*, before we can know, Whether they were lawful *Bishops* or no. And we cannot know them to be lawful *Bishops*, unless we knew the *Intention* of the *Priest*; and therefore it remains proved with Evidence equal to a *Demonstration*, that your *Certainty* of your *Churches* *Infallibility*, can be no greater than that you have of the *Priest's* *Intention* in the Administration of *Sacraments*.

And by this it appears, how absurdly you go about to compare the Case of *Pope and Council*, with that of the *Prophets and Apostles* of old. For you challenge not an *Infallibility* by immediate *Inspiration*, but such as is constantly resident in the *Church*, by vertue of some particular *Promises*, which must suppose the *Persons* in whom it lodges to be actually *Members* of the *Church*. And therefore all the proof of their *Infallibility* depends upon the *Certainty* of that, which you can never satisfy any rational men in; but, I hope, you will not say, it was so in the *Prophets* and *Apostles*. Besides, *God* never sent any *Persons* with a Message from himself to the *World*, but he gave the *World* sufficient Evidence in point of Reason that He sent them; either by *Miracles*, the *Testimony* of other *Prophets* who wrought them, or some other satisfactory way to humane Reason, as I have elsewhere proved at large. But there is no such thing in your Case, no rational Evidence at all is offered, but we must believe the *Council* lawful because *Infallible*, and we must believe it *Infallible* because it defines it self to be so. Neither is it possible to conceive that any man should believe whatever the *Prophet* or *Apostle* said, to be *Infallibly true*; unless he were before convinced, that they were *Infallible* who spake it. But for this you have a further Answer, That it is not necessary to believe the *Infallibility* of the *Proposer*, viz. *prioritate temporis*, in respect of time, and afterwards the *Infallibility* of the *Doctrine* he proposeth: but it sufficeth to believe it first *prioritate naturæ*, so as the *Infallibility* of the *Teacher* be presupposed to the *Infallibility* of his *Doctrine*. But what this makes to your Purpose, I understand not. For it is not the *Time*, but the Evidence we enquire for, or the *Ground* on which we are to believe the *Proposer* *Infallible*. Whether it must not be something else besides the implicit defining himself to be *Infallible*? You assert that to be a sufficient *Ground* in the Case of *Pope and Councils*; and I pray, Will it not be as sufficient in the Case of a *Quaker*, or *Enthusiast*? May not they as well pretend this, that they are *Infallible*? And if you ask them what Evidence they have for it, they may tell you, just the same that *Pope and Council* have to be so: For, as they implicitly define themselves to be *Infallible*, so do they. So that, talk what you will of private *Spirits* and *Enthusiasms*, I know none lay so great a Foundation for them as you do upon this Pretence; That we are to believe the *Pope and Council* *Infallible*, because implicitly they define themselves to be so. Than which, one could hardly meet with

a more,

a more absurd Answer from the highest *Enthusiast*: For he can tell you as boldly, that he hath the *Spirit of God*, because he hath it; and just so much you say, and no more, *Pope and Council are Infallible, because they are Infallible*. But I must pity you: I know you would not willingly have run into these *Absurdities*, but it was your hard Fortune to maintain a bad Cause, and you could not possibly help it; for the *Straights* you were in, were so great, that you must venture thorow some great *Absurdity* to get out of them. But all the Pity I have for you is gone, when I read your next Words. *Thus we conceive the Relator's Achilles is fallen*. How fallen? If he be, it is only with *Antæus*, to rise the stronger. But I assure you, so far was he from falling by any force of your Answer, that he stands more impreguably than ever, having not so much as a *Heel* left, that you can wound him in. And if you have nothing more to say, than what you here give us in answer to this Argument, which you tell us, *is the common Answer of Divines*; I am so far from wondring that his Lordship took no notice of it, that I shall only wonder at the Weakness of your Judgment, or largeness of your Faith, that can so contentedly swallow such grand *Absurdities*.

If this be but, as you say, the Prologue to the Play, I doubt you will find but a sad *Catastrophe* in it: The main Business, you tell us, *is about the Priest's intention, concerning which he positively lays down, that it is not of absolute Necessity to the Essence of a Sacrament, so as to make it void, though the Priest's Thoughts should wander from his work, at the Instant of using the Essentials of a Sacrament; yea, or have in him an actual Intention to scorn the Church*. What now have you to shew to the contrary? If the Priest's Intention be not absolutely necessary to the essence or validity of a Sacrament, you desire a Reason of your Adversaries, *Why we should not think a Priest consecrates the body of Christ, as much at a Table where there is Wheaten Bread before him, and that either by way of disputation, or reading the 26 Chapter of S. Matthew, he pronounces the Words, Hoc est corpus meum, as he doth at the Altar; since here is the true form, Hoc est corpus meum, the true matter Wheaten Bread, and he that pronounces the form, is a true Priest, and yet in all Mens Judgment here's no true Sacrament made. Something else therefore is requisite to the Essence of a Sacrament, and, What can that possibly be, if it be not the Intention which the Church requires?* Since your Request is reasonable, I shall endeavour your Satisfaction, and the rather because it tends to the full clearing the Business in hand. To your Enquiry then, I answer, That the Institution of Christ requiring such a Solemnity for the Administration of it, and such a Disposition in the Church for the receiving it, and the Performance of such Acts, in order to the Administration, by the Dispenser of it; these do sufficiently distinguish the Lord's Supper from all other Actions, what Matter, Form, or Person soever be there. Were not in the Apostles times the assembling of the People together for this end, and the solemn Performance of the Acts of Administration, sufficient to discriminate the Lord's Supper, from reading the 26 of Matthew, by an Apostle at the Table, when there was Bread and Wine upon it? And I must confess, I cannot but wonder that you should be so much to seek as not to know the one from the other, unless you knew the Priest's Intention? But I consider, your Question was not made for Apostolical times, but for private Masses, wherein the Priest may mumble over the Words of Consecration to himself, and none else be the wiser or better for what he saith, or doth. Here it was indeed very requisite you should make the Priest's Intention necessary to discriminate this Action, from that you mentioned; but, where-ever the Lord's Supper is duly administered according to the Primitive Institution, the Solemnity of the Action and Circumstances

do so far individuate it, as sufficiently to difference it from any other *Formalities* whatsoever. And so it is in *conferring Orders*; Is there not enough, do you think, in the *Solemnity* of the Action, with the preceding *Circumstances*, and the *Bishops* laying on of his *Hands*, with the using the Words proper to that Occasion, to difference it from the *Bishops* casual laying his Hands on the Head of a man, and in the mean time reading perchance the *Words of Ordination*? We assert then, that no further *Intention* is at all necessary to the Essence of a *Sacrament*, but what is discoverable by the outward Action. Which being of that Nature, which may difference it self by reason of peculiar *Circumstances* from others, there is no imaginable Necessity to have recourse to the private *Intention* of the *Priest* for Satisfaction. But see how unreasonable you are herein; for you would make that to be necessary to distinguish a *Sacramental Action* from any other, which it is impossible any man should be acquainted with. For, if I had no other way to distinguish in the Case you mention, but the *Priest's Intention*, I must be as much to seek as ever, unless I certainly knew what the *Priest's Intention* was; which if you have an Art of being acquainted with, I pretend not to it. Is it then necessary to distinguish the one from the other, or not? If not, To what end is your Question? If it be, To what Purpose is the *Priest's Intention*, when I cannot know it? But you would seem to object against the *Circumstances* discriminating a *Sacramental Action*.

1. *If the Circumstances do shew to the Standers by, that the Priest really intends to make a Sacrament, and this Signification be necessary; Then the Priest's Intention is necessary, or else, Why is it necessary it should be signified?* I answer, The *Circumstances* are not intended to signify the *Priest's Intention* any further, than that *Intention* is discoverable by the *Actions* themselves, so that it is not any inward *Intention* which is thereby signified, but only such an *Intention* as the outward *Action* imports, which is the Celebration of the *blessed Sacrament*. So it is not the *Priest's* intending to make a *Sacrament*, as you phrasifie it, but his intending to celebrate it, i. e. not such an *Intention* as is unitive of matter and form, as your *Schools* speak in this Case, but such as relates to the external *Action*. But against this you urge, 2. *That such external Signification is not at all necessary; for say you, Might not a Catholick Priest, to save the Soul of some dying Infant, baptize it, if he could, without any such Signification by Circumstances?* Yes, and a very charitable Man he would be in it too, if without any *Signification* by *Circumstances*, he could save the Soul of a dying Infant. But I should think his meer *Intention* were sufficient, and that the chief *Priest* would supply the rest, as the *Schools* determine in a like Case. For they put a very hard Question to themselves, *If the Intention of a Priest be necessary to the Validity of a Sacrament, then, What becomes of the Soul of an Infant, which dies, being baptized without the Priest's Intention?*

To which they answer, *It may be very piously believed, that in that Case, summus Sacerdos supplebit, the High Priest will supply that Defect*; and what they say of *Intention*, is much more true of *Baptism* it self; for in Case it be not done out of Contempt, I say that *summus Sacerdos supplebit*: It is not the meer want of *Baptism* will damn the Soul of the *Infant*, (as you suppose) when you make it so necessary, to use such *Shifts* as you speak of, to save the Soul of a dying *Infant*. But, Do you thing seriously, that is the way to do it; for a *Priest*, under a *Physical Pretence* to sprinkle Water on the Child's Face often, and once among the rest, to say softly, or by way of Discourse, *Ego te baptizo, &c. with Intention to conferr the Sacrament?* But you ask however, *Whether the Child be not really baptized by this, although none took notice of what the Priest did?* I answer, though we should grant it, yet it proves not that the

Priest's

Alexand. Alen-
sis part 4.
quest. 8. memb.
3. art. 1. sect. 1.
Res sine prae-
judicio, &c.
Bonaventur. c.
4. dist. 6. art. 2.
quest. 1. ad fin.

Priests inward Intention was it which made it a *Sacrament*; but the Observation of the *Institution* of Christ in the external Actions; and so far, as that is observed in this odd kind of baptizing, so far it is *Baptism*, and no more. There are two Things therefore to be observed in *Sacramental Actions*. 1. The differencing of them from other common or ordinary Actions, and this we say is done by the *Circumstances* attending them. 2. The *Validity* of them as *Sacraments*, and this depends wholly and only on the Observation of *Christ's Institution*. For, as it is *Institution* which makes a *Sacrament*, so it is the Observation of it, which makes this a *Sacramental Action*, and not another. But in neither case is the *Priest's Intention* necessary to the *Essence* of a *Sacrament*; for it may have its full Force in all Respects it was appointed for, whatever the *Priests inward Intention* be. So that neither of your Instances, as to the *Sacraments* of *Baptism*, or the *Eucharist*, do at all imply the Necessity of the *Priest's Intention*, in order to the *Essence* of a *Sacrament*, in either of them.

As for the *Inconvenience* which, you say, the *Bishop* pretends would follow out of this *Doctrine*, viz. that no *Man* can rest secure that he hath been really made *Partaker* of any *Sacrament*, no not of *Baptism* it self. You answer, 1. That as to the far greater part of *Christians*, the *Inconvenience* follows as much out of the *Bishop's Principles* as yours, that they cannot be absolutely certain that they are baptized; because the *Priest* may vitiate something pertaining to the *Essentials* of *Baptism*. 2. You answer, That *moral Assurance* is sufficient in such Cases, i. e. such as is liable to no just cause of doubting and suspecting the contrary. We accept of this latter Answer in reference to your Retortion of the *Inconvenience* upon us, as to which we say, That where is no sufficient cause of doubting, a *Man* ought to rest satisfied. But I shall now shew you, that this *moral assurance* cannot be sufficient in your Case, and that for these Reasons, 1. Because you build a main Principle of *Faith* upon it, and you say, That *moral Assurance* cannot be a sufficient Foundation for *Faith*; for then all your Discourse of the Resolution of *Faith*, comes to nothing, which runs upon this Principle, That nothing short of *Infallibility* can be a sufficient Foundation for *Faith*. Now that you build a Principle of *Faith* upon it, is evident, as I have proved already, even all that *Infallibility* you pretend to in *Church*, *Pope*, and *Council*; for all depends upon this, that you certainly know, that such Persons in your *Church* have had the *Sacrament* of *Baptism* truly administred, which cannot be without knowing the *Priest's Intention*. 2. Because you acknowledged before, that there must be such a certainty as is sufficient to ground an *Infallible Belief*; for this you placed in his Lordship's Objection, and this you pretended to satisfy, by saying, That the *Pope* and *Council* implicitly define themselves to be *Infallible*; and therefore you fall much beneath your self now, when you say, *Moral Assurance* is sufficient. 3. Because we have far greater ground for *moral Assurance* than you: for we make no more requisite to the *Essence* of a *Sacrament*, than what all Men are competent Judges of; and our *Church* allows no such *Baptisms*, wherein none but the *Priest* is present; therefore if he vitiates any thing essential to *Baptism*, it may easily be discovered; but in your case you have no positive Assurance at all of the *Priest's Intention*, the utmost you can pretend to, is, your having no ground to suspect it, which in many cases there may be. So that you cannot have properly a *moral Certainty*, which hath some Evidence to build it self upon; but in your case there can be no Evidence at all of the *Priest's Intention*, and therefore the Knowledge of it is uncertain and conjectural. So that there is a vast difference between that *moral Assurance*, which we may have from the external Action, and that which you can possibly have

from the *Priest's Intention*. 4. The Danger is far greater, in not having this *Assurance* upon your Principles, than upon ours, and yet we have far greater *Assurance* than you can possible pretend to. Your Danger is manifestly greater, as appears by this evident Demonstration of it, *viz* that in Case the *Priest's Intention* be wanting, you must, by your own Confession, be guilty of *gross Idolatry*; and yet you cannot certainly know, what the *Priest's Intention* was. This is plain in the Case of the *Eucharist*, whose *Adoration* you profess to be *lawful*, because you suppose *Christ* to be present there. Now this depends upon a thing impossible for you certainly to know, and that is the *Priest's Intention in the Consecration*. For if the *Priest* wanted that *inward Intention* which you make necessary to the *Essence* of a *Sacrament*, then, for all his pronouncing the Words of *Consecration*, *Hoc est corpus meum, Christ's Body* may not be there; and in case it be not there, you are by your own Confession guilty of *Idolatry*, for you do not then worship *Christ*, but meerly the *Bread*. Therefore, supposing *Adoration* of the *Eucharist* upon your Principle of *Transubstantiation* were not *Idolatry*, yet since that depends upon a thing impossible to be known. Who can with a good Conscience do that, which he cannot be certain, but in the doing it, he may commit the *greatest Idolatry*? Wherefore, all the ill Consequences of this Doctrine of the *Intention* of the *Priest* considered, besides the palpable Errors of it, never was any Doctrine more imprudently contrived, or more weakly managed, than when this was decreed at the Councils of *Florence* and *Trent*.

ð. 5.
P. 284, &c.

You spend many Words to explain that *virtual Intention* which the *Schools* have taken up from *Scotus* upon this Subject; but, all that you say, adds nothing of Satisfaction: Upon these Grounds, 1. Because this *virtual Intention* must suppose some *actual Intention*, so it is in all those Cases you mention of a *Servant on his Journey, a Labourer at his Work*; tho' these may not have always an *express Intention* of the Design of their Journey or Labour, yet there is sufficient Evidence from both of them, to know they had an *actual Intention*, and there is no necessity of knowing any more of it, than what their *Actions* discover: but in your Case it is necessary to know that there was once an *actual Intention*, because upon that depends the *Essence* of the *Sacrament*: And that is it which we object against you, that you cannot have any *Assurance* that the *Priest* ever had an *express Intention*. We do not therefore say, that any wandring Thoughts after, do destroy the *essence* of a *Sacrament*; but the want of an *actual Intention* at all upon your Principles doth it, and this you cannot be certain of upon your Grounds. And therefore your *virtual Intention* doth you no service at all; for you say, *This virtual Intention is, when the Priest doth really operate, or celebrate the Sacrament in virtue of an express Intention which he had to do it*; therefore it necessarily follows, that the *Essence* and *Validity* of the *Sacrament* must depend upon the first *express Intention*, and not the after virtual one. So that if you cannot be certain of the first *actual Intention*, the *Sacrament* may want its *Essence*, for all that you know. 2. Though a *virtual Intention* may be consistent with some wandring Thoughts from the first *Intention*, yet not with an *express Intention* to the contrary. As in your own Instance, A *Servant* sent upon *Business*, hath at first an *express Intention*, to do what his Master commands him; after, falling into Company upon his Way, he loseth for the time his *actual Intention*; but, as long as he goes on upon his first *Business*, he retains, I grant, a *virtual Intention* of it: But, supposing that Company dissuade him from it, or his own Mind turn, so that he hath an *actual Intention* to the contrary, Will you say, this man retains his *virtual Intention* still?

still? Now our Argument doth not lie meerly in this, that the *Priest*, at the instant of *Consecration*, may have his Mind distracted from the matter, in which case you say, *The virtual Intention* remains still, and is sufficient; but, that you cannot have any *Certainty*, but he may have an *actual* and *express Intention* to the contrary, at the instant of *Consecration*, and this destroys his *virtual Intention*, and consequently the *Essence* of the *Sacrament*. For, as long as you require an *inward Intention*, besides the *external Action*, you must be assured, that he had no actual contrary *Intention* at that time, or else your *virtual Intention* signifies nothing to your Purpose or Satisfaction. That which remains, is concerning *Catharinus*, of whom his Lordship says, *That being present at Trent, he disputed this case very learnedly, and made it most evident, that this Opinion cannot be defended, but that it must open a way for any unworthy Priest, to make infinite Nullities in the Administration of Sacraments; and that his Arguments were of such Strength, as amazed the other Divines which were present. And concluded, that no internal Intention was required in the Minister of a Sacrament, but that Intention which did appear, opere externo, in the work it self performed by him; and that if he had unworthily any wandring Thoughts; nay more, any contrary Intention within him, yet it neither did, nor could hinder the blessed effect of any Sacrament.* To this you answer, *That the Cardinal Palavicino is clear of Opinion, that the Council decreed nothing against him; because he denied not an Intention to be necessary in the Sacrament, but only explicated the thing differently from the common way of the Schoolmen.* But whosoever will read the Arguments which *Catharinus* used in the Council of *Trent* against the *Priest's Intention*, will easily find that he disputes against all manner of *inward Intention*, but such as may be discovered by the external Action. But we must consider that *Palavicino* had a particular Kindness for *Catharinus*, as being of *Siena* (the present *Pope's Country*) insomuch that *Cæsar Aquilinius* saith, *If Luther had been of Siena, the Cardinal Palavicino would have defended him:* and thence he endeavours to vindicate him in the Point of Certitude of *Grace*, as well as in this of the *Priest's Intention*, though in both, he goes contrary to the general Sense of your *Divines*, both then at *Trent*, and ever since; who looked on both Opinions of *Catharinus*, as condemned there, as is manifest by *Bellarmin*, *Suarez*, *Vasquez*, *Valentia*, and others. But however, we may observe this from hence, What an excellent Rule of Faith, and judge of Controversies the Decrees of your Council of *Trent* are, when there have been, and are still, such different Opinions, and eager Contests about the Sense of them; that in one point *Dominicus à Soto* saith, the Council decreed of his side, *Catharinus* saith just the contrary, and yet both great *Divines* and present in the Council. And in this Doctrine of the *Intention* of the *Priest*, the general Apprehension then was, and hath been since, that *Catharinus* his Opinion was condemned there, but *Cardinal Palavicino* undertakes to prove the contrary. So that in the mean time here is like to be a fair end of Controversies, by your pretended Infallible Decrees of Councils, when you are so far from being agreed, what the Sense of them is: and yet *You, You* are the Men who say, *Controversies* cannot be ended by the *Scripture*, because there are such Differences in the Sense and Interpretation of it. Thus (we hope) we have sufficiently vindicated his Lordship's first Charge of Error against your Pretended General Councils, confirmed by the *Pope*.

Before we come to the second, you say, *His Lordship presents such a quaint Subtilty against the Pope's Right to confirm them, and the Necessity of his Confirmation, that you cannot well avoid the taking notice of it.* Thus then, you

P. 273.

P. 285.

d. 6.
P. 258.

you say, he argues, *No Council is confirmed till it be finished; and when it is finished, even before the Pope's Confirmation be put to it, either it hath erred, or it hath not erred: If it hath erred, the Pope ought not to confirm it; and if he do, it is a void Act: for no Power can make Falshood Truth: If it hath not erred, then it was true before the Pope confirmed it; so his Confirmation adds nothing but his own Assent.* As quaint a Subtilty as you call this, I am sure you are hard put to it, to return any satisfactory Answer to it. For you distinguish of the Pope's joyn't-consent, and of his actual Confirmation; in case, say you, the Pope either in Person, or by his Legates concur with the Council, then the Definition is unquestionably Infallible; but in case he doth not, then the actual Confirmation is necessary; but in case the Council err, the Pope ought not, and it is impossible he should confirm it; but if he doth not err, you grant it is true, before the Pope confirms it, but his Confirmation makes us infallibly certain that it is true. This is the full force of your Answer, which by no means takes off the Difficulty, as will appear, 1. That by reason of the Pope's rare Appearance in General Councils (never in any that are unquestioned by the Greek and Latin Church-
De Concil. l. 2. es.
c. 11.
 of his Legates suffice; for it is determined by Bellarmine, and proved by many Reasons, that though the Pope's Legates consent, yet if they have not the express Sentence of the Pope, the Council may err notwithstanding. So that still the Pope's actual Confirmation is supposed necessary, and that after the Definitions of the Council are passed. And this is the case which his Lordship speaks to: and for your answer to that, I say, 2. That in plain Terms you assert the Pope's personal Infallibility, which you disowned the Defence of before: for you say, In case the Council err, not only the Pope ought not to confirm it, but that it is impossible he should. Which, what is it other than to assert, that the Pope shall never err, though the Council may? Neither is it sufficient to say, *That he shall never err in confirming the Decrees of a Council:* for in this case the Council is supposed actually to err already, so that nothing of Infallibility can be at all supposed in the Council; and if the Pope be not considered in his personal Capacity, he might err as well as the Council. From whence it follows, since you suppose that a Council may err, but not the Pope, that you really judge the Council not to be Infallible, but the Pope only. 3. When you say, That if the Council erred not, the Pope's Confirmation doth not make the Definition true, but makes us infallibly certain that it is true. I enquire further, Whereon this Infallible Certainty depends? On a Promise made to the Council, or to the Pope? Not to the Council, for that you grant may err; but it is impossible the Pope should confirm it, therefore still it is some Promise of the Pope's Infallibility which makes Men Infallibly certain of the Truth of what the Council decrees. 4. To what purpose then are all those Promises and Proofs of Scripture which you produced concerning the Council's Infallibility, if, notwithstanding them, a General Council may err? Only the Pope shall never confirm it, and although it do not err, yet we cannot be Infallibly certain of it, but by the Pope's Confirmation. And let any reasonable Man judge, whether a promise of the Pope's Infallibility, though there be none at all concerning Councils, be not sufficient for all this? So that upon these Principles you take away the least degree of Necessity of any Infallibility in Councils, and resolve all into the Pope's Infallibility. For to what purpose are they Infallible, if we cannot be certain that any thing which they decree is true, but by the Pope's Confirmation?

§. 7.

But that the Pope's Confirmation cannot make the Decrees of those you account General Councils Infallible, nor us Infallibly certain of the Truth of them,

them, his Lordship proves by another Evidence in matter of Fact, viz. *That the Pope hath erred by teaching in and by the Council of Lateran (confirmed by Innocent 3.) that Christ is present in the Sacrament by way of Transubstantiation. Which (his Lordship saith) was never heard of in the Primitive Church, nor till the Council of Lateran; nor can it be proved out of Scripture; and taken properly cannot stand with the Grounds of Christian Religion. This you call a strange kind of proceeding to assert a Point of so great Importance; without solving or so much as taking Notice of the pregnant Proofs your Authors bring both out of Scripture and Fathers to the contrary of what he mainly affirms. How pregnant those Proofs are, we must examine afterwards; but his Lordship might justly leave it to those who assert so strange a Doctrine to produce their Evidence for it. Especially, since it is confessed by so many among your selves, That it could not be sufficiently proved, either from Scripture or Fathers to bind Men to the Belief of it, till the Church had defined it in the Council of Lateran: Since, the more moderate and learned Men among your selves (Bishop Tonstall for one) have looked on that Definition as a rash and inconsiderate Action. Since, the English Jesuits confessed, that the Fathers did not meddle with the Doctrine of Transubstantiation. Since, Suarez confesseth that the Names used by the Fathers, are more accommodated to an accidental Change. Since, Father Barnes acknowledgeth that Transubstantiation is not the Faith of the Church, and that Scripture and Fathers may be sufficiently expounded of a Supernatural Presence of the Body of Christ without any Change in the Substance of the Elements. For which he produces a large Catalogue of Fathers and others. Since therefore we have such Confessions of your own Side, What need his Lordship (in a Controversie so thoroughly sifted as this hath been) bring all the Testimonies of both sides which had been so often and so punctually examin'd by others? At least (you say) he should have cleared how Transubstantiation may be taken improperly, whereas of all the Words which the Church useth, there is none methinks less apt to a Metaphorical and figurative Sense, than this of Transubstantiation. By which I see you are a Man who would really seem to believe Transubstantiation, and are afraid of nothing, but that it should not be impossible enough for you to believe it. For his Lordship was only afraid, that though the Word it self were gross enough, yet some of the more refined and subtle Wits might transubstantiate the Word it self, and leave only the Accidents of it behind, by taking it in a spiritual Sense; as Bellarmine confesses those Words of St. Bernard, *In Sacramento exhiberi nobis veram carnis substantiam sed spiritualiter non carnaliter*, have a true Sense; but adds, *that the Word Spiritualiter must not be too often used*; and the Council of Trent would seem to provide an Evasion by *Sacramentaliter*: and his Lordship not well knowing what they would have by such Expressions, therefore he saith, *properly taken it cannot stand with the Grounds of Christian Religion. And for all those Expressions, Bellarmine as well as the Council take it in as gross a manner as you can desire; and I think the Physician who wanted Impossibilities enough to exercise his Faith, needed nothing else to try it, but your Doctrine of Transubstantiation. But you say, The term indeed was first authorised by the Council of Lateran, as ὁμοῖοι by that of Nice; but for the thing it self signified by this Term, which is a real Conversion of the Substance of Bread into the Body of Christ and of Wine into his Blood, 'tis clear enough, that it was ever held for a Divine Truth. If you**

P. 257.

P. 287.

Scotus in 4. sent. dist. 11. q. 3.
Gabr. Biel in Canon. Missa. lect. 40.
Fisher contr. capitul. Babyl. c. 9. p. 49.
Cajetan. in 3. Qu. 75. A. 1.
Petrus de Alliaco in 4. sent. q. 6.
Tonstall de verit. corp. Christi, &c. p. 46.
Erasmus in 1. Cor. 7.
Ferus in Matth. 26.
Apud Episcop. Eliens. resp. ad Apol.
Cardinal. Bellarm. cap. 1. p. 7.
Suarez in 3. disp. 50. sect. 3.

Barns Catholico-Romanus Pacificus. M5.
f. 7. liter. C.

P. 288.

prove

Part. 1. ch. 5.
sect. 7.

prove but that, I will never quarrel with you about the *Term*, call it *Transubstantiation* or what you will ; but we do not think it so clear, as not to want Proofs stronger for the Belief of it, than all the Repugnancies of Sense and Reason are against it. For it is a vain thing for you to attempt to prove so unreasonable a Doctrine as this is, by some few lame Citations of *Fathers*, unless you can first prove that the *Authority* of them is so great, as to make me believe any thing they say, though never so contrary to Sense and Reason. If you could bring some Places of the *Fathers* to prove that we must renounce absolutely the Judgment of Sense, believe things most contradictory to Reason, yet you must first shew that the *Evidence* they bring is greater than that of *Sense* or *Reason*. Or that I am more bound to believe them, than I am to believe the greatest Evidence of *Sense* or *Reason*. When you say, *In these Cases we must submit Reason to Faith* ; we acknowledge it, when it is no manifest Contradiction, in things so obvious to Sense or Reason, that the asserting it, will destroy the use of our *Facul ties* and make us turn absolute *Scepticks* ; for then *Faith*, must be destroyed too. For may not a Man question, as well, whether his hearing may not deceive him as his Sight, and by that means he may question all the *Tradition* of the *Church*, and what becometh of his *Faith* then ? And if his *Sight* might deceive him in a proper object of it, Why might not the *Apo- stle's* Sight deceive them in the *Body* of Christ being risen from the Grave ? And if a Man may be bound to believe that to be false which his Sense judges to be true, what Assurance can be had of any *Miracles* which were wrought to confirm the *Christian Doctrine* ? And therefore his Lordship might well say, *That Transubstantiation is not consistent with the Grounds of Christian Religion*. But of this I have spoken already. That which I am now upon, is not how far *Reason* is to be submitted to *Divine Authority*, in case of *Certainty* that there is a *Divine Revelation* for what I am to believe ; but how far it is to be renounced, when all the Evidence which is brought is from the *Authority* of the *Fathers* ? So that the Question in short is, Whether there be greater Evidence that I am bound to believe the *Fathers* in a matter contrary to Sense and Reason, or else to adhere to the *Judgment* of them though in Opposition to the *Father's* Authority ? And since you do not grant their *Authority* immediately *Divine* ; since you pretend not to Places as clear out of them as the Judgement of *Sense* and *Reason* is in this case ; since you dare not say, that all the *Fathers* are as much agreed about it, as the *Senses* of all Mankind are about the matter in Dispute ; I think with Men who have not already renounced all that looks like Reason, this will be no matter of Controversie at all. From whence it follows, that supposing the *Fathers* were as clear for you (as they are against you) in this Subject, yet that would not be enough to persuade us to believe so many *Contradictions* as *Transubstantiation* involves in it merely because the *Fathers* delivered it to us. I speak not this, as though I did at all fear the Clearness of any *Testimony* you can produce out of them, but to shew that you take not a competent Way to prove such a Doctrine as *Transubstantiation* is. For nothing but a stronger Evidence than that of *Sense* and *Reason*, can be judged sufficient to oversway the clear Dictates of both.

- §. 8. This being premised, I come to consider the clear Evidence you produce out of *Antiquity* for this Doctrine, and since you pretend to so much choice in referring us to *Bellarmino* and *Gualtierus* for more, I must either much distrust your Judgment, or suppose these the *clearest* to be had in them, and therefore the Examination of these will save the Labour of searching

searching for the rest. And yet it is the great Unhappiness of your Cause, that there is scarce one of all the Testimonies you make use of, but either its Authority is slighted by some of your own Writers, or sufficient Reasons given against it by many of ours: Your first is of St. Cyprian (or at least an *Serm. de Cana Domini.* Author of those first Ages of the Church) who speaking of the Sacrament of the Eucharist, saith, This common Bread changed into Flesh and Blood giveth Life. And again, The Bread which our Lord gave to his Disciples being changed not in its outward Form or Semblance, but in its inward Nature or Substance, by the Omnipotency of the Word is made Flesh. As to this Testimony there are two things to be considered, the Authority, and the Meaning of it. For its Authority, you seem doubtful your self, whether S. Cyprian's or no (since Bellarmine and others of your own deny it) but at least you say, An Author *De amiss. l. 6. c. 2.* of those first Ages of the Church, but you bring no Evidence at all for it. Bellarmine grants that he is younger than St. Augustine; and others say that none mention him for 800 Years after St. Cyprian's time. And the abundance of Barbarisms which that Book is so full fraught with, manifest, that it is of a much later Extraction than the time it pretends to. But the matter seems to be now out of Question; since the Book is extant in the King of France's Library, with an Inscription to Pope Adrian, and a MS. of it *James of the Fathers. p. 12.* is in the Library of All-Souls in Oxford, with the same Inscription, and the Name of Arnaldus Bonavillacensis; who was St. Bernard's Co-temporary, and lived in the twelfth Century. And those who have taken the Pains to compare this Book with what is extant of the same Author in the *Bibliotheca Patrum*, not only observe the very same Barbarisms, but the same Conceptions and Expressions about the Sacrament, which the other hath. *Albertinus de Eucharist. Sacramento, l. 2. p. 381.* Although therefore I might justly reject this Testimony as in all Respects incompetent, yet I shall not take that Advantage of you; but, supposing him an Author as ancient as you would have him, I say he proves not the thing you bring him for. For which, two Things must be enquired into. 1. What kind of Presence of Christ he asserts in the Sacrament. 2. What Change he supposes to be made in the Elements. For your Doctrine asserts, That there is a Conversion of the whole Substance of Bread and Wine into the Substance of the natural Body and Blood of Christ, and that this conveniently, properly, and most aptly is called Transubstantiation. Now if this Author speaks wholly of a real but spiritual Presence of Christ, and if he asserts that the Substance of Bread and Wine do remain still, you can have no Pretence at all left, that this Author asserts your Doctrine of Transubstantiation. For the first, he expressly saith, That these things must not be understood after a carnal Sense: viz. unless ye eat the flesh and drink the blood of the Son of man, ye shall have no life in you; for Christ himself hath said, His Words are spirit and life. And nothing can be more evident, than that this Author speaks not of any corporeal, but spiritual Presence of Christ, by the Effects which he attributes to it, calling it *inconsumptibilem cibum*, that Food which cannot be consumed; and the Reason he gives of it, is, because it feeds to eternal Life, and therefore he saith it is *immortalitatis alimonia*, that which nourisheth to Immortality; which cannot possibly be conceived of the corporal Presence of Christ, since you confess the Body of Christ remains no longer in the Body than the Accidents of the Bread and Wine do. And after he tells us, What the feeding upon the Flesh of Christ is, viz. our Hunger and desire of remaining in Christ, by which the Sweetness of his Love, is so imprinted and melted as it were within us, that

Sed in cogitationibus hujusmodi, caro & sanguis non prodest quidquam; quia sicut ipse magister exposuit, verba hæc spiritus & vita sunt: nec carnalis sensus ad intellectum tantæ profunditatis penetrat, nisi fides accedat, Auctor de Cana Domini, sect. 4.

Esus igitur carnis hujus quædam aviditas est, & quoddam desiderium manendi in ipso per quod sic imprimimus. & eliquamus in

nobis dulcedinem charitatis, ut hareat palato & visceribus sapor dilectionis infusus penetrans & imbuens omnes animæ corporisque recessus. Id. sect. 9.

Ut sciremus quod mansio nostra in ipso sit manducatio, & potus quasi quadam incorporatione, subjectis obsequiis, voluntatibus junctis, affectibus unitis. Id. ib.

*Et non tam corporali quam spirituali transi-
tione Christo nos uniri. Sect. 4.*

*Hæc quoties agimus, non dentes ad morden-
dum acuimus, sed fide sincerâ panem san-
ctum frangimus & partimur. Id. sect. 18.*

*Sed immortalitatis alimonia datur, à com-
munibus cibis differens, corporalis substan-
tiæ retinens speciem, sed virtutis divinæ
invisibili efficientiâ probans adesse presen-
tiam. Id. f. 2.*

Id. sect. 6.

*Cod. Theod. de
cursu publ. &
leg. 67.*

*Arcad. l. ult.
De munerib.
& honor.*

*Cassiod. l. 12.
Vegetius de re
milit. l. 3. c. 3.*

*Ambros. serm.
21. de die san-
cto Epiphani.*

*Augustin. in
Psalm. 82.*

the savour of it may remain in our Palate and Bowels, penetrating and diffusing it self through all the Recesses of Soul and Body. And so just before he saith, Christ did, Spirituali nos instruere documento, instruct us by a spiritual Lesson, that we might know, that our abiding in him is our eating of him, and our drinking a kind of Incorporation, by the Humility of our Obedience, the Conjunction of our Wills, the Union of our Affections. And in another Place denies, That there is any corporal Union between Christ and us, but a spiritual; and therefore adds afterwards, As often as we do these things, we do not sharpen our Teeth to bite, but break and divide the holy Bread by a sincere Faith. All which and many other Places in that Au-

thor make it plain, that he doth not speak of such a corporal Presence as you imagine, but of a real but spiritual Presence of Christ, whereby the Souls of Believers have an intimate Union and Conjunction with Christ, which he calls Societatem germanissimam, in which respect they have Communion with the Body of Christ. But I need mention but one place more to explain his meaning, in which he fully asserts the spiritual Presence of Christ, and withal

that the substance of the Elements doth remain. That immortal Nourishment is given us, which differs from common Food, that it retains the Nature of a corporeal Substance, but proving the Presence of a Divine Power, by its invisible

Efficiency. So that what Presence of Divine Power there is, is shewed in regard of the Effects of it, not in regard of any substantial Change of the Bread into the Body of Christ; for in reference to that Efficiency he calls it. immortal Nourishment, and afterwards, That as common Bread is the Life of the Body, so this super-substantial Bread is the Life of the Soul, and Health of the Mind. But I know you will quarrel with me for rendring, corporalis substantiæ retinens speciem, by retaining the Nature of a corporeal Substance; for you would fain have Species to signify only the Accidents of a corporeal Substance to remain. This being therefore the main thing in dispute, if I can evince that Species signifies not the bare external Accidents, but the Nature of a corporeal Substance, then this Author will be so far from asserting, that he will appear point blank against your Doctrine of Transubstantiation. Now I shall prove that Species was not taken then, for the meer external Shape and Figure, but for the solid Body it self especially of such Things as were designed for Nourishment. Thence in the Civil Law we read of the species annonariæ, and of the species publicæ, largitionales, and fiscales; and those who had the care of Corn are said to be Curatores specierum; and thence very often in the Codes of Justinian and Theodosius, there is mention of the species vini, species olei, species tritici. But lest you should think, it is only used in this Sense in the Civil Law, not only Cassiodore and Vegetius use it in the same Sense for the species tritici, and species annonariæ; but, that which comes home to our purpose, St. Ambrose uses it where it is impossible to be taken for the meer external Accidents, but must be understood of the Substance it self: speaking of Christ's being desired to change the Water into Wine he thus expresses it, Ut rogatus ad nuptias aquæ substantiam in vini speciem commutaret, that he would change the Substance of Water into the Species of Wine; Will you say, that Christ turned it only in the external Accidents and not the Nature of it? So when St. Austin says, that Christ was the same Food to the Jews and us, significacione non specie, he opposes Species to a meer Type, and therefore

therefore it imports the Substance and reality of the thing. And so the Translator of Origen opposes the *regeneratio in specie* to the *Baptismus in anigmate*, and the *manna in enigmate* to the *manna in specie*: in both which, being opposed to the Figure it denotes the Reality. And one of those Authors whom you cite, in the very same Book and Chapter which you cite, uses *species sanguinis* for the substance of Blood, for he opposes it to the *similitudo sanguinis*; for when the Person objects, and says, That after the Cup is consecrated *speciem sanguinis non video*, I do not see the Nature or Substance of Blood; he answers him, *Sed similitudinem habet*, But it hath the resemblance of it; for as (saith he) there is the Similitude of his Death, so there is the Similitude of his Blood. These may be sufficient to shew that *species corporalis substantiæ*, does not relate to the external Shape and Figure, but to the Nature and Reality of it: So that his meaning is, although it remains still the same Substance of Bread and Wine; yet there is such an invisible Efficacy of Divine Power going along with the use of it, as makes it to nourish the Souls of Men to eternal Life.

And now it will be no matter of Difficulty at all to Answer the Places you bring out of this Author. The first is, *This common Bread changed into Flesh and Blood giveth Life*. But how little this Place makes to your purpose is easie to discern, because we do not deny a Sacramental Change of the Bread into the Flesh and Blood of Christ, but only that substantial Change which you assert, but that Author sufficiently disproves, even in that very Sentence from whence those Words are cited, if you had given them

us at large. For, saith he, that common Bread being chang'd into Flesh and Blood, procures Life and Increase to our Bodies; and therefore from the usual Effect of Things, the weakness of our Faith is helped, being taught by a sensible Argument, that the effect of eternal Life is in the visible Sacraments, and that we are not united to Christ so much by a Corporal as Spiritual Union. In which

*Panis iste communis in carnem & sanguinem mutatus procurat vitam & incrementum corporibus; idcirco ex consuetudine rerum effectu, fidei nostra adjuva infirmitas, sensibili argumento edocta est, visibilibus sacramentis inesse vite aeternae effectum, & non tam corporali quam spirituali transi-
one Christo nos uniri. Id. sect. 5.*

Words he compares the Sign and the thing signified together: that as the Bread being Sacramentally changed into the Flesh and Blood of Christ, doth yet really give Life and Nourishment to our Bodies, (which certainly is far enough from that substantial Change into the Body of Christ, which you assert) so by that effect of the Sign it self upon our Bodies, our Faith is helped the better to understand the Efficacy of the thing signified upon our Souls, in order to eternal Life; there being as real, though spiritual Union between Christ and Believers, as there is between the Bread and our Bodies. And that this is the plain and unsophisticated meaning of this Author in these Words, I dare appeal to the impartial Judgment of any intelligent Reader. By which we see, Those first Words of the change of the Bread into the Flesh and Blood of Christ, must be understood of a sacramental, and not a substantial Change. But your other is the great and (as Bellarmine thinks) unanswerable Place; which you thus render, *The Bread which our Lord gave to his Disciples, being changed not in its outward Form and Semblance, but in its inward Nature and Substance, by the Omnipotency of the Word is made Flesh*. As to which place, I must tell you first, that there are very shrewd Suspicions of some unhandsome Dealings with it; for some great Criticks have assured us, that the Place is corrupted, and that the ancient MSS. read it quite otherwise, *non effigie, nec natura mutatus*, which is so far from your purpose, that it is directly against it; and this seems far more consonant to the following Words; For, saith he, as in the Person of Christ, the Humanity was seen, but the Divinity lay hid; so

Panis iste quem Dominus discipulis porrigebat, non effigie, sed naturâ mutatus, omnipotentia verbi factus est caro. Id. sect. 6.

Et sicut in personâ Christi humanitas visibatur, & latebat divinitas; ita Sacra-

mento visibili, ineffabiliter divina se infundit essentia. Ib.

in the visible Sacrament, the divine Essence doth infuse it self after an unexpressible manner. In which it is considerable, how he doth parallel these two together;

for as the humane Nature of Christ did substantially remain, notwithstanding the Presence of the divine Nature, so to make good the Parallel, the substance of Bread and Wine must remain too, and that because he doth not say, That the Body of Christ is present, which might exclude the Substance of the Elements, but the divine Essence, which only imports a spiritual and real Presence. And when he saith, That the Bread is neither changed in its Form or Nature, when by the Omnipotency of God it is made Flesh (i. e. as to the real Communion which Believers have of the Body of Christ; which is an Act of divine Power as well as Goodness) he saith no more, than Theodoret, Ephraim, and Gelasius do expressly speak. For,

Οὐδὲ γὰρ μετὰ τὴν ἀγίασμον τὰ μυστικά σύμβολα τῆς δικταίας ἐξίσταται φύσεως. μένει γὰρ ἐπὶ τῆς προτέρας ὕλης, καὶ τὸ σχῆμα, καὶ τὸ εἶδος καὶ ὁρατὸν ἐστὶ καὶ ἀπῆλ, οἷα καὶ πρὸς ἐν ἡν. Theodoret. Dialog. 2. Tom. 1. p. 85.

Ὅτι τὴν φύσιν μεταβάλλων, ἀλλὰ τὴν χάριν τῇ φύσει προστεθεικός. Id. Dialog. 1.

Τὸ πρὸς τῶν πιστῶν λαμβανόμενον σάμα χρεῖς, καὶ τῆς αἰδιότητος ὕλης ἐκ ἐξίσταται, καὶ τῆς νοητῆς ἀσπίδος μὴν χάρις. Apud Photium in Biblioth. Cod. 229. p. 794.

Certè Sacramenta quæ sumimus, corporis & sanguinis Christi, divina res est, propter quod & per eadem divina efficitur consortes natura, & tamen esse non desinit substantia vel natura panis & vini. Gelas. tract. advers. Eutych. & Nestor.

saith Theodoret, The mystical Symbols after Consecration, go not out of their own Nature, but remain in their former Substance, Figure, and Shape, and are visible and tangible as they were before? Which Words, considering the Occasion and Importance of them, are so express, as nothing can be more. And in his former Dialogue, he gives an account, Why the external Symbols are called

by the Names of the Body and Blood of Christ, not by changing their Natures, but by superadding Grace to Nature; which is the same with that our Author saith here, Though neither Figure nor Nature be changed, yet by God's Omnipotency it is made Flesh; that πρὸς τῇ χάριτι, in Theodoret, and this omnipotentia Dei, here, importing the same Thing. To the same purpose Ephraim the famous Patriarch of Antioch speaks in Photius. For,

saith he, the Body of Christ, which is received by Believers doth not lose its sensible Substance; and yet is inseparable from spiritual Grace. And so Gelasius, as plainly as either of the foregoing, asserts, That the Sacraments of the Body and Blood of Christ, which we receive, are a divine Thing, through and by which we are made Partakers of the divine Nature (which answers to the Omnipotency of God, by which it is made Flesh, in our Author) and yet it doth not cease to be the Substance, or Nature of Bread and Wine (which is the same with the former Clause, That the Bread is not changed in Figure or Nature.) So that the ancient reading of this Place is not only consonant to the other Parts of his Discourse, but asserts no more than is in express Terms said by genuine and unquestionable Authors; who plainly overthrew your Doctrine of Transubstantiation. For these Testimonies being so express for the remaining of the Substance of Bread and Wine after Consecration, are of far greater Force against it, than the highest Expressions concerning the Change of the Elements can make for it. For in these they speak their Judgments, clearly and punctually against Hereticks, and speak that which is absolutely inconsistent with Transubstantiation; but in their other they speak mystically and sacramentally; and their most lofty Expressions, must be understood by the Nature and Design of their Discourse, which is to represent symbolical Things in the most lively and affecting manner. But when our Adversaries are urged with the former Testimonies, they then tell us, That Substance and Nature are not always taken properly, but sometimes at large for the Accidents or use of things: but although this can never be applied to the Places of the foregoing Authors, in their Disputations with the

Eutychian

Eutychian Hereticks; yet from thence we are furnished by themselves with a further Answer to this Place. So that although we admit of the present reading, *non effigie, sed naturâ mutatus*, yet since by their own Confession *Nature* doth not always import the *Substance* of a thing, they cannot in any Justice or Reason from hence infer a *substantial Change*. Let them then take their choice, Whether are the Words of *Substance* and *Nature* in the *Fathers* always to be taken properly, or no? If they must be taken so, we have three unquestionable Testimonies of ancient *Fathers* directly against *Transubstantiation*, and we only lose the Testimony of an *uncertain Author*, built upon an *uncertain Reading*, and contrary to other *Expressions* in the same Book: If they be not, then from the change of *Nature* here expressed, no such thing as a *substantial Change* can be inferred, but only *accidental*, upon Consecration, in regard of the *Sacramental Use* and Effect of it. Which that it is nothing Strange in *Antiquity*, might be easily proved, but that our *Adversaries* Confession saves me the Labour of it.

The second *Testimony*, is of *Gregory Nyssen*, out of whose *Catechetical Oration* you produce these Words, *With good Reason do we believe, that the Bread being sanctified by God's Word, is changed into the Body of the Word of God: and a little after, The Nature of the Things we see being trans-elemented into him.*

I might here tell you, What Exceptions are taken against this Book, as not being genuine, not only by *Protestants* (as *Fronto Ducæus* would have it, because of these Expressions) but by others too. But I will not insist on this, because I see no sufficient reason to question the *Authority* of it; yet I know not how you can excuse it from some *Interpolations*, since he therein mentions *Severus*, an *heretical Acephalist*, who lived not till after *Gregory's* time; yet for the main of the Book, I say as *Casaubon* doth, that it is, *Opus planè eximium si paucos nævos excipias*, An excellent Piece in the general, and becoming its Author, some few *Escapes* excepted. And the Design of it being to shew, that *Christian Religion* hath nothing absurd or unreasonable in it, it would be very strange that he should assert so absurd and unreasonable a Doctrine, as *Transubstantiation* is. But there is nothing tending to that in the Places cited, but only the use of those two Words, *μεταποιῆσαι* and *μετασχηματίζειν*;

for the main force of all you say, depends upon them. So that if we can give a good Account of them, without any *Transubstantiation*, there remains no Difficulty at all in these Words of *Gregory Nyssen*. For, we deny not that there is a change in the Elements after Consecration, but we say, It is a *Sacramental*, and you,

That it is a *substantial Change*, and this you offer to prove from these two Words here used in Reference to the *Eucharist*. The Argument commonly formed by your Authors from the first Words, is, *Whatsoever is changed, is not what it was before*; which we readily grant, so far as the change is; but still it remains to be proved, that the *Substance* is changed in it self. But it were easie to shew, that the Word *μεταποιῆσαι*, in multitudes of Places of the *Fathers* is used for an *accidental* and *relative Change*, and *Gregory Nyssen* himself very frequently uses the Word, where it is capable of no other Sense, as when he saith, *Of the shining of Moses his Face, that it was ἡ ἐν τῷ εὐδοχεύοντι μετέμορφωσις*, a change to that which was more glorious; and when he affirms, *the Souls of men by the Doctrine of Christ, μεταποιῆσθαι πρὸς τὸ θεϊότερον*, to be changed into that which is more divine. And in this same *Catechetical Oration* he uses it several times to the same Purpose, about the change which shall be in glorified Bodies, and the change of Men's Souls by Regeneration: But I need not insist more on this, since I produced before the Confession of *Suarez*, that such Expressions

q. 10.

Not. in Greg.
Nyss. p. 45.

If. Casaub. Not.
in Greg. i. Epist.
ad Eustath.
c. p. 99.

Καλῶς ἔν τε τὸν τῷ λόγῳ τῷ θεῷ ἀ-
μαζόμενον ἄρτον εἰς σῶμα τῷ θεῷ λόγῳ με-
ταποιῆσαι πνεύματι, πρὸς ἐκείνῳ με-
τασχηματίζοντι τὸν φαινόμενον τὴν φύσιν.
Gregor. Nyssen. orat. Catechet. cap. 37.
Tom. 3.

De vita Mosi.
Hom. 1. in
Cant.
Orat. Catech.
c. 37. c. 40.

Expressions are more accommodated to an accidental Mutation. Neither is there any more Strength in the other Word, μετασχηματίζω, though Suarez thinks this comes nearer the Matter, and you confidently say, *What can here be signified by trans-ementation of the Nature of the outward Element, but that which the Church now stiles Transubstantiation?* I will therefore shew you, what else is signified by that Word which Gregory used, which cannot be properly rendred *trans-ementation*; for μετασχηματίζω, doth not come from the Noun σκῆμα, but from the Verb σκῆματιζω, and the Greeks expound σκῆματιζω by τῶν, σχηματίζειν: and so μετασχηματίζω by μετατρέπειν, μετασχηματίζειν, μεταλλάττειν; as you may see in Suidas, and others. So that it imports not a *substantial*, but an *accidental Change* too: and in that Sense Gregory Nyssen uses it to expresse *Regeneration* by, τοὺς ἐξ παλινγενεσίας, μετασχηματισμένους, those who are *trans-emented* by *Regeneration*; Would you say, those who are *transubstantiated* by it? So that neither of these Testimonies import any more than that there is a *Sacramental Change* in the *Elements* after *Consecration*, by which Believers are made Partakers of the *Body and Blood of Christ*; which is no more than we assert, and falls far short of your Doctrine of *Transubstantiation*.

Epist. Canon.

φ. 11.

Cyril. Catech.
Mystagog. 4.

Your third Testimony is, of S. Cyril of Hierusalem, which you would make us believe, *is so full and clear, that no Catholick could expresse his own, or the Churches belief of this Mystery in more full, plain, and effectual Terms*: Neither shall I here stand to dispute the Reasons on which those *Mystagogical Discourses* under his Name are questioned, but proceed to the Consideration of the Testimony it self. Which lies in these Words, *He that changed Water into Wine by his sole Will (at Cana in Galilee) doth he not deserve our Belief, that he hath also changed wine into blood? Wherefore let us receive with all assurance of Faith, the body and blood of Jesus Christ, Seeing under the Species of Bread the Body is given, and under the Species of Wine his Blood is given, &c. knowing and holding for certain, that the Bread which we see, is not Bread (tho' it seem to the Taste to be Bread) but the Body of Jesus Christ; likewise that the Wine which we see (though to the Sense it seem to be Wine) is not Wine for all that, but the Blood of Jesus Christ.* This Testimony you have patched together out of several Places in that *Oration*, very warily leaving out that, which would sufficiently clear the meaning of S. Cyril in the Words you cite out of him. For it is evident, that his Design is to perswade the Catechumens (from whom the *mysterious Presence of Christ's Body* in the *Sacrament* was wont to be concealed) that the Bread and Wine were not *meer common Elements*, but that they were designed for a greater and higher Use to exhibit the *Body and Blood of Christ to Believers*. And therefore he saith expressly,

Μὴ πρὸς ἑξέως ἐν αἰς ἡμιλοῖς τῷ ἄρτῳ καὶ τῷ οἴνῳ σώμα καὶ αἷμα χρίστος καὶ τὴν θεοσύνην τυγχάνει ἀπόφασις. Id. ib.

Do not consider them as meer Bread and Wine, for they are the Body and Blood of Christ, according to his own Words.

By which it is plain he speaks of the *Body and Blood of Christ*, as *sacramentally*, and not *corporeally* present; for he doth not oppose the *Body and Blood of Christ*, to the *Substance of Bread and Wine*, but to *meer Bread and Wine*, i. e. that they should not look on the Bread and Wine as *naked Signs*, but as *signa efficacia*. and that there is a *real Presence of Christ* in and with them to the *Souls of Believers*. And this is it which he saith, *That they ought not to make a question of, since Christ said, This is my Body, and this is my Blood.* For if he could by his Will turn the *Water into Wine*, shall we not believe him, that he can change his *Wine into his Blood*? And after adds, *That under the Symbols of Bread and Wine, the Body and Blood of Christ is given, that thou mayest be a Partaker both of his body and blood.* You render this under the *Species or form of bread and wine*, in Cyril it is ἐν τῷ πρῳ, in that which is the

Figure

Figure or Representation of the Body and Blood of Christ; for $\tau\upsilon\pi\omega\varsigma$ is not taken in your Sense for the external Accidents, which you call the Species, but for that which doth figure or represent; for in his next Catechetical Discourse he calls the Bread and Wine, $\alpha\nu\tau\iota\tau\upsilon\pi\omega\varsigma \sigma\acute{\alpha}\lambda\omega\alpha\tau\omega\varsigma \kappa\alpha\iota \alpha\iota\mu\alpha\tau\omega\varsigma \chi\epsilon\iota\varsigma$, the Figure of the Body and Blood of Christ, and this Theophylact, and those who assert Transubstantiation, deny that the Bread and Wine are $\alpha\nu\tau\iota\tau\upsilon\pi\omega\varsigma$. For where there are $\alpha\nu\tau\iota\tau\upsilon\pi\omega\varsigma$, there must be $\alpha\epsilon\chi\epsilon\tau\upsilon\pi\omega\varsigma$, which must answer to them; if Cyril therefore makes the bread and wine to be $\alpha\nu\tau\iota\tau\upsilon\pi\omega\varsigma$, he must make the body and blood of Christ to be the $\alpha\epsilon\chi\epsilon\tau\upsilon\pi\omega\varsigma$, and consequently they cannot be the very body and blood of Christ in your Sense. This $\alpha\nu\tau\iota\tau\upsilon\pi\omega\varsigma$ and $\tau\upsilon\pi\omega\varsigma$ here have the same Signification, and are the same with $\sigma\upsilon\mu\beta\omicron\lambda\omicron\gamma$, and so when he saith, $\epsilon\nu \tau\upsilon\pi\omega\ \gamma\alpha\rho\ \delta\epsilon\ \epsilon\tau\alpha\ \delta\iota\delta\omicron\tau\alpha\ \sigma\omicron\iota\ \tau\omicron\delta\ \sigma\omicron\mu\alpha$, $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \epsilon\nu \tau\upsilon\pi\omega\ \delta\iota\delta\omicron\tau\alpha\ \sigma\omicron\iota\ \tau\omicron\delta\ \alpha\iota\mu\alpha$, his meaning cannot be, under the Accidents of bread and wine, the body and blood of Christ is present in your Sense, for he speaks of such a Presence as hath Relation to the Receiver, and not the Elements; for he saith, Under the Type of bread and wine, the body and blood of Christ is given to thee. For otherwise it had been far more to his Purpose to have said absolutely, that under the species of bread and wine, the body and blood of Christ is substantially present; but, when he saith only that it is given to the Receiver, it doth not belong to such a corporeal Presence as you dream of, but to such a real and spiritual Presence, whereby Believers are made Partakers of the body and blood of Christ. And therefore Christ is in this well explained by that of Tertullian, *Hoc est corpus meum, id est, figura corporis mei*, This is my body, i. e. the figure of my body, which is the same with $\tau\upsilon\pi\omega\varsigma$; and by that of S. Austin, *Non dubitavit Dominus dicere, Hoc est corpus meum, cum daret signum corporis sui*, Christ did not scruple to say, This is my body, when he gave the figure of his body: And elsewhere speaking of Judas his being present *ad convivium in quo corporis & sanguinis sui figuram discipulis commendavit & tradidit*, at that Supper in which Christ commended and delivered to his Disciples the figure of his body and blood. So that hitherto there is nothing in the Testimony of Cyril, importing Transubstantiation. But it may be you think, there is more force in it, where he saith, That we must not believe our Senses, that that which we see is not bread, tho' it seem to the taste to be so, &c. As to which I answer, that this Place of Cyril must be explained by that which went before it, wherein he said, That we must not judge it to be meer bread and meer wine. For, although Sense be a sufficient Judge of that which it sees and tastes, yet it cannot be a Judge of that which is exhibited by that which is seen and tasted; therefore, though to the taste, it seems to be nothing but common bread and wine, yet they ought to believe that it is the Communion of the body and blood of Christ. So that this is not to be understood of the Elements themselves, but of the mystical and sacramental Nature of them. And, as Cardinal Perron hath observed, It is an usual thing, for the greater Emphasis sake, to deny that to be, which is meant only respectively; or to express the Affirmation and Denial of some Qualities, by the Affirmation or Denial of the Substances themselves: As in that of Tully, *Memmius semper est Memmius*, for one; that in S. Ambrose, *Ego non sum ego*, for the other: And in many other Instances to the same Purpose, in which he saith, Though the Substance seem to be denied, yet only some Quality is understood by it. So when Cyril here saith, That bread is not bread, &c. he means not by it any alteration of the Substance of it, but that it is not that common bread which it was before, and as our sight and taste judge it still to be. And what he saith here of the bread in the Eucharist, he said the same before of the Chrism, where he compares them both together. For (saith he) do not think that to be meer Oyntment; for as the bread of the Eucharist

Catech. Myst. 5.

Theophyl. in Marc. 14.

Tertul. c. Marcion. l. 4. c. 40.
August. c. Adimant.

Comment. in Psal. 3.

after

Ἄλλ' ἔσθ' μὴ ὑπονοήσῃς ἐν αὐτῷ τὸ μίγον
 φιλοῦναι ὥσπερ ὁ ἅγιος τῆς ἀρχαίας
 εὐχάριστος μετὰ τὴν ἐπίκλησιν τὴν ἁγίαν πνεύματος
 ἐκ ἐπ' αὐτῶν λητὸς, ἀλλὰ σῶμα
 χριστοῦ. ἔγωγε καὶ τὸ ἅγιον τὸ τοῦ μίγον ἐκ
 ἐπ' αὐτῶν, ὅς' ὡς ἂν εἴποι τις κοινὸν μίον
 ἐπίκλησιν, ἀλλὰ χριστὸν χάρισμα καὶ πνεύμα
 ματὸς ἁγίου, παρσία τῆς αὐτῆς θεότητος
 ἐκκλησιαστικῆς γινόμενοι. Cyril. Mystag. 3.
 p. 235.

Catech. Illum. as *Spiritual Grace*; so that he means not a *substantial Change* in the *Eucharist*, any more than in the other, but only *relative* and *sacramental*.

§. 12. Neither can any thing more be inferred from your Testimonies out of your last Author *S. Ambrose*, there being nothing at all in the Words you produce, which implies any *substantial Change* in the Elements; for, although it be only *sacramental*, yet it may be truly said, *It is no longer that which Nature hath framed it (viz. meer Bread and Wine) but that which the Benediction of Consecration hath made it to be*: Which I grant to be the Body and Blood of Christ, but not in your gross and corporeal Sense. So *S. Chrysostome* saith of Baptism, *That its Virtue is so great, it doth not suffer men to be men*; Will you therefore say, it *transubstantiates* them? But you add further out of him, that he saith, *The force of Benediction is greater than that of Nature, seeing by that Nature it self is often changed*? And so we assert too, that the force of Benediction far exceeds that of *Nature*, which can so alter *common Elements*, as by the use of them, to make us Partakers of the Body and Blood of Christ. Your last Words are out of the Counterfeit *S. Ambrose*, which are only general, *viz. this bread, is bread before the Words of the Sacrament; but when Consecration comes, of bread, it is made the flesh of Christ*. This we deny not, but the Dispute is about the Sense in which it is made so, whether by a *substantial Change* of the Bread into the Body of Christ; and that this cannot be his Author's Meaning, appears by those known Words which are used by him, speaking of the Efficacy of Christ's Power in the Sacrament; whereby he can make, *ut sint quæ erant & in aliud commutentur, that they might be what they were, and yet be changed into something else*. And, although a great Controversie hath been raised about the reading of these Words, yet this reading is not only justified by many Authors of competent Antiquity, but by two MSS. in the *King of France's Library*, besides many others elsewhere, and all Editions, but that at *Rome*, and others which follow it. So that this Author plainly asserts, that the *Substance* of the *Elements* does remain still, and therefore can only be understood of a *Sacramental Change*.

Thus I have, to satisfy you, examined your Testimonies in Behalf of *Transubstantiation*; but whereas you referr me for more to *Bellarmino* and other *Catholick Authors*, I shall referr you for Answer to those no less *Catholick Authors*, though no Believers of *Transubstantiation*, who have taken large and excellent Pains in answering what they have brought, either from *Scripture* or *Antiquity*. But you, having done your best in the latter, come at last to the former; but so pitifully manage your Business as to *Scripture*, that it had been more for the Interest of your Cause, you had never meddled with it. For you only say, *That the Words of Scripture, taken in their proper and literal Sense, do evidently shew, that the only Substance which is delivered in this Sacrament, is the Body of Christ, and that the Substance of Bread is no more there*. And all this comes only from hence, because Christ saith, *This is my Body*, which you parallel with one, pointing to a *Hogshead of Wine*, saying, *This is wine*; and with one holding up a Purse full of

Money,

Money, saying, *This is Gold*: who if they intend to speak Truth, must signifie, that the only Liquor contained sub propria formâ, in the Hogshead is Wine; and all the Money in the Purse, Gold. But how weak this is, will easily appear, 1. That you take it for granted, that the Expression of Christ is not at all Figurative, but of the same Nature with those Propositions you mention, whereas it is largely proved, from the Nature of a Sacrament, from many parallel Expressions in Scripture, from Evidence of Antiquity, Sense, and Reason, that these Words of Christ cannot be otherwise than figuratively understood. 2. You suppose that Christ must speak of the individual Bread, when he said, *This is my Body*, as our parallel Instances are of such Individuals as are pointed to. But Bellarmine will tell you, *That if Christ had spoken of the Bread, when he said, This is my Body, absurdissima esset locutio, it had been a most absurd Speech.* And Vasquez saith, *If the Pronoun Hoc, This, should relate to the Bread, he confesses, that by virtue of those Words, there could be no substantial Change made in it; for the Bread must remain still.* So that by the Confession of your own Authors, your Parallel is absurd, and destructive to the Doctrine of Transubstantiation. Vasquez. disp. 180. c. 9. n. 91.

The third Error of a General Council confirmed by the Pope which his Lordship insists on, is, *That of administering the B. Sacrament to the Laity under one kind only.* Of this he had spoken before; and thither you refer us for your Answer; but I purposely omitted the handling it there, because it comes in more properly in this Place. There his Lordship hath these Words: *To break Christ's Institution is a damnable Error, and so confessed by Stapleton. The Council of Constance is bold, and defines peremptorily, that to communicate in both kinds is not necessary, with a non-obstante to the Institution of Christ; and although Bellarmine answers, that the non-obstante only belongs to the time of receiving it after Supper, yet his Lordship shews from the Words of the Council, that the non-obstante must relate to both Clauses foregoing, and hath as much force against receiving under both kinds, as against receiving after Supper. Tea, and the after Words of the Council couple both together, in this Reference; for it follows, & similiter, And so likewise, though in the Primitive Church, &c. And a Man by the Definition of this Council may be an Heretick for standing to Christ's Institution, in the very Matter of the Sacrament: And the Church's Law for one kind may not be refused, but Christ's Institution under both kinds may. And yet this Council did not err; no, take heed of it.* But all this cannot persuade you, *That the non-obstante relates to any thing but to the receiving after Supper*: which I much wonder at, since the Design of the Decree of the Council was not to determine so much concerning the Time of receiving, as the Kinds in which it was to be received. Now to have said point blank, that, notwithstanding the Institution of Christ to the contrary, they decreed that the Sacrament should be received in one kind only, would have been too plain and gross: and therefore they fetch it about with a compass, and put in something not so much controverted then, the better to disguise the Opposition between their Decree and Christ's Institution. But yet by the adding the Administration in both Kinds to the time of receiving, and the non-obstante following both, and the Decree being against that which is acknowledged to have been done by Christ, nothing can be more evident, than that the Sense of the Decree implies a non-obstante to Christ's Institution. For otherwise, to what Purpose do they say, *Although*

p. 13.

p. 259.

p. 270.

Licet Christus post carnem instituerit, & suis discipulis administraverit sub utraque specie panis & vini, hoc venerabile Sacramentum; tamen, hoc non obstante, non confici debet post carnem, nec recipi nisi à jejunis; similiter, quod licet in Primitivâ Ecclesiâ Sacramenta reciperentur sub utraque specie à fidelibus, tamen hæc consuetudo, ut Laicis sub specie panis tantum suscipiatur, habenda est pro lege, quam non licet reprobare: & asserere hanc esse illicitam, est erroneum, & pertinaciter asserentes sunt arcendi tanquam hæretici. Concil. Constant. Sess. 13.

B b b b

Christ

*Christ administred the Sacrament in both Kinds, and although the Primitive Church so received it, if they did not intend to decree something contrary to that Administration and the Practice of the Primitive Church? Therefore, whether by the meer form of Words the non-obstante doth relate to Christ's Institution or no, is not material, since the Decree it self is directly opposite to it. Although therefore they did not put receiving in one kind immediately after the non-obstante (which is that you object) as they do, not consecrating after supper, and receiving fasting, yet the Force of it reacheth to what follows after: as not only appears by the Connexion And likewise, but chiefly by the Scope of the Decree it self. For the Proctors of the Council, Henricus de Piro, and Johannes de Scribanis, in their authentick Instrument, never exhibited any Controversie at all concerning the time of receiving; but only concerning the Communion in both kinds, because, they said, there was an ill Custom (so the observing Christ's Institution was called) for some Priests to give the Cup to the Laity, therefore they desired the Council, &c. So that it appears, this bringing in the time of receiving was only the Artifice of the Contrivers of the Decree, that they might with less Noise and Clamour thwart the plain Institution of Christ. And accordingly it appears by the Title of the Decree, that the Intent of it was to forbid the giving the Sacrament to the People in both kinds, and so Caranza delivereth the Canon it self. *Præcipimus sub pænâ excommunicationis, quod nullus presbyter communicet populum sub utrâque specie panis & vini.* Indeed, in the late Editions of the Councils by Binius, a Complaint is supposed to be made concerning the celebrating the Sacrament after Supper by some, which he seems to take out of Cochläus, as appears by his Notes; but in the Instrument it self nothing appears of that Nature: and since the Decree contains nothing against that Custom as well as the other; it seems probable that this was made use of the better to bring on the other. But, whether it were so or no, is not very much material; for however the Council confessing that Christ did so administer it, and that it was the Custom of the Primitive Church, their prohibiting of it doth in its own Nature imply a non-obstante to the Institution of Christ.*

Caranz. Sum.
Con. p. 415.

Concil. Tom. 7.
p. 2 p. 1042.

ð. 14.
P. 271.

But this is that you stiffly deny, in saying, That neither the Decree of the Council nor the Practice of the Church in administering under one kind is contrary to the Institution and Ordination of Christ. For, say you, to shew this, the Bishop should have made it appear that Christ did so institute this Sacrament of his last Supper, that he would not have one part to be administred without the other, or that he would not have one part to be taken without the other. And it cannot be proved that Laymen are bound to receive in both kinds, from those words, Drink ye all of this; For if this were a Command and not a Counsel, it was given to the Apostles who all drunk of the Chalice. So that the State of the Question is this, Whether the Primitive Institution be universally obligatory to all Christians, or no? For you suppose, that either it was only a Counsel, or else it had particular Reference to the Apostles. For the clearing therefore of this Question, there are but two ways whereby we can judge of the obligatory Nature of such Institution; either by an expresse Declaration of the Will of the first Institutor, or by the universal Sense of the Church concerning the Nature of that Institution. And if these two appear evident in this present Case, you will have no cause to question, but the Communion in one kind is a Violation of the Institution of Christ. There are two Ways whereby we may judge what the Will of the Legislator is: First, by an expresse positive Command. Secondly, by an unalterable Reason on which the Institution is founded. Now that both these are clear in the Case of Communion in both kinds I now come to manifest. First, by a positive Command. For although we grant a Difference between

between an *Institution* and a *Command*, in this respect, that the *Institution* properly respects the *Thing*, and a *Command* the *Person*; and that an *Institution*, barely considered as such, doth not bind all Persons to the *observance* of it; as we say, *Matrimony* is *Instituted* by *God*, but do not thence assert that all Persons are *bound* to it, but yet take an *Institution* as it refers to Persons, and so it is æquipollent with a *Command*. And so *Christ's Instituting* that all who believe should be *baptized*, is of the Nature of a *Command* to that Purpose. But here is a great Difference to be made between such Things as were *done* at the *Institution*, and such Things as were *Instituted* to be *done* afterwards. Thus *Christ* washed his *Disciples Feet*, administered *after Supper*, and only to *twelve*; but it doth not follow that these *Circumstances* must be still observed, because though they were done then at that *Celebration*, yet *Christ* doth not *Institute* or appoint the doing of them, when ever that *Sacrament* should be administered afterwards. For we are to consider, that though there were some things peculiar to the first *Institution*, yet the main of it was intended for the *Church* in all following times. Or else we must make the *Celebration* of the *Eucharist* it self to be a meer Arbitrary thing. Which if it be not, there must lie an *Obligation* on Men for the *Participation* of it; Now this *Obligation* must suppose a *Law*, and therefore we have gained this, that the *Institution* of the *Eucharist* doth imply a *Command* for its *Observation* in the *Church*. So that this *Action* of *Christ* was not merely a matter of *Counsel*, but there is something in it perpetually *obligatory*: Because it was not a peculiar *Rite* appropriated to the present time, but intended for the future Ages of the *Church*. This being proved in the *General*, that there is a perpetually obligatory *command*, implied in the *Institution*; we are now to enquire, How far this *Command* extends? Whether it extended only to the *Apostles*, or else to all *Believers*? That it was administered then to the *Apostles* only is granted, but the Question is, In what Capacity it was administered to them, Whether only as *Apostles*, or as *Believers*? And that must be judged by the Intention of the *Institution*, Whether it were of that Nature as to respect their *Apostolical Office*, or else some thing which would be common with them to all other *Believers* to the *World's end*? If it were only and wholly proper to the *Apostles*, there can be no reason given, why the *Institution* of the *Sacrament* should continue after their times: Neither could any other but the *Apostles* have any right, either to administer or to receive it. It follows then, that this *Sacrament* was not instituted merely for the *Apostles*; if not for them merely, then what was contained in the *Institution* doth concern others as well as them. Now there are four things commanded in the *Institution*, *Take, eat, drink ye all of this, and, This do in remembrance of me*. If the *Institution* doth not merely respect the *Apostles* as such but others also, then some of these things at least must extend to others too considered as *Believers*. And if some, why not all of them? Were the *Apostles* considered as *Believers*, when they were bid to *take and eat*? And as *Apostles*, when *Christ* said, *drink ye all of this*? What reasonable Pretext can be imagined for such a groundless Fancy? If they were not considered as *Believers*, when *Christ* said *take, eat*; By what Right can any *Believers* *take and eat*? If they were then, so were they likewise afterwards, when *Christ* said to them, *Drink ye all of this*. As far therefore as I can possibly see, you must either admit the People to *drinking all of this*, or else deprive them of their Right of *taking and eating*. And if you did speak consistently, you must say, that the Peoples being admitted at all to the *Eucharist* is an Act of Favour and Indulgence in the *Church*, but not necessary by any *Command* of *Christ*, the *Eucharist* being administered to the *Apostles* and

not the *People*; and therefore it being *Indulgence* to admit them at all, it is in the *Churches* Power to admit as far and to what she pleases. This is the only rational way I can imagine, whereby you may defend the excluding the *People* from the *Cup*: But this you dare not say; and therefore are put to the weakest Shifts imaginable to reconcile it with the *Institution* of *Christ*.

Some therefore say, *That all these are Words only of Invitation and not of Command, and that they only give a right, and not oblige men to do it.* But if these be only Words of *Invitation*, what *Precept* is there any where extant for the Celebration of the *Eucharist*? That they are an *Invitation* we deny not; but we say they are such an *Invitation* as imply a *Duty* to come too. When a *Father* bids his *Children* come and sit down at *Table*, take and eat their *Meat*: This is an *Invitation*, but such as by reason of the *Authority* of the Person carries a *Command* with it. So it is here, *Christ* invites to come, to take, eat, and drink; but so that it implies a *Command* that men should come; or else it must be wholly left at *Mens Liberty*, so that it is no *Sin* for Men to neglect or refuse to come. And if the *Institution* of *Christ* only gives men a *Liberty* to take, eat, and drink, without any *Obligation* to these things as a *Duty*, How comes the Administration of the *Eucharist* at all to become a *Duty*, since there are no other Words of command than what are contained in the *Institution*? Which others being sensible of, they most unreasonably distinguish between taking and eating, which they make an absolute command, and, *Drinking* all of this, which they say is only a conditional *Precept*: and the Reason they give, is,

1 Cor. 11. 25. because S. Paul saith, *This do ye as oft as ye drink it in remembrance of me*; and so, say they, *Do this, doth not imply a Command for the doing it, but only the Relation which that Action hath to the Death of Christ when they do it; for those Words; as oft as you do it, do suppose it not to be simply necessary, but only shew, when they do it, to what Purpose it should be done.* But if there be any weight, in this, it will as well hold still concerning the Participation of the *Bread*, as the *Cup*; for, as the *Apostle* saith *This do as oft as ye drink it in remembrance of me*, so he adds in the Words immediately following, *For as often as ye eat this Bread and drink this Cup, ye do shew forth the Lord's Death till he come.* If therefore it notes only the Relation of the *Action* to its end without a *Command* for Performance in the one, it must do so in the other also. And so all the *Sacrament* will be a meer Matter of *Liberty* in the Church, whether Men will observe it or no. But *Bellarmino* with wonderful Subtilty hath found a *Command* for the one and not the other; which

De Eucharist. l. 4. c. 25.

Luke 22. 19. is, *That in Luke after the Bread, Christ saith, This do in remembrance of me, but omits it wholly after the Cup; by which, saith he, we are to understand, that Christ commanded that the Sacrament should be administred to all under the Species of Bread, but not under that of Wine.* And this he is so transported with, *That in a Rapture he admires the wonderful Providence of God in the Scripture, who by this Means hath taken away all possibility of Evasion from the Hereticks.* So it should seem indeed, when even his Brethren the *Jesuits* can scarce hold laughing at this Subtilty. Since, S. Paul puts that Expression, *This do in remembrance of me*, not after the *Bread*, but after the *Cup*. And therefore may we not more justly admire at the *Providence* of God in thus suffering Men who will not see the Truth under a Pretence of Subtilty, to infatuate themselves. And although it be added here, *As oft as ye do it*, yet both *Vasquez* and *Suarez* ingenuously confess, that contains under it a *Command* for the doing it. For, saith *Vasquez*, *Qui præcipit ut opere aliquo commemoratio fiat alicujus beneficii accepti, ex modo ipso præcipiendi præcipit etiam ut fiat opus ipsum. Quis hoc non videat? He that commands that by*

Vasquez. in 3. Thom. c. 2. disput. 213.

something

something to be done a Commemoration should be made of a Benefit received ; from the manner of commanding it, he doth command that very Action to be done. Who doth not see this ? And Suarez faith, Those Words, Do this, or with that Addition, In remembrance of me, or with that Condition, As oft as ye do it, ad eundem finem referuntur, come all to the same purpose. So that still it follows, if there be a Command for one, there is for the other also. But yet there is a Subtily beyond any of these ; which is, That Christ in these Words in Luke after the Distribution of the Bread, Hoc facite, Do this, did make the Apostle's Priests ; and therefore, although they did receive the Bread as Believers, yet they received the Cup as Priests, and so that belongs only to the Priests and not to the People. What will not these Men prove which they have a mind to ! But it is their Unhappinefs, that their own Subtities do them the most Mischief, as appears by these Things consequent from hence ; which are repugnant to their own Principles. 1. That Priests not consecrating, ought to receive the Cup, as well as those that do. For it is plain, that the Apostles did not consecrate now, but only receive ; and therefore this belongs to them as receiving, and not as consecrating. And by the same Reasons that Priests not consecrating may receive, others may receive too. 2. That if they were made Priests by those Words, after the Distribution of the Bread, then they have no Power to consecrate, but only the Bread. For the Words are, Hoc facite, Do this, i. e. that which Christ had then done. Otherwise, if those Words be taken with reference to the Cup, then if the Apostles received the Bread as Believers, they received the Cup so too ; for these Words, Do this, must not relate to their receiving, but to their Power of Consecration. 3. If this be taken generally, Do this, and so giving them a Power to do all that Christ did, then it will amount to a Precept for all who administer to follow Christ's Example in the Institution. And therefore, as he did administer, the Cup, as well as the Bread, to all that were present, then all others will be bound to do so, if their Power of Administration be derived from these Words, Do this, and they refer to the whole Action of Christ. But I know what Answer will be here given, That these Words relate to the Sacrifice, and not to the Sacrament, Hoc facite, implying their Power of sacrificing, as to which they say, both Elements are necessary, but not to the Sacrament. But 1. Not to enter on the Dispute about the Sacrifice ; if both Elements be necessary to it, then it was great Reason that the Words making them Priests, should come after both Elements, and therefore it cannot in Reason be deduced from those Words which are spoken only after the Bread. 2. If these Words relate to the Sacrifice, and not to the Sacrament, By what Authority do they administer the Sacrament ? What other Words are there to give them a Power to do the one distinct from them, whereby they pretend a Right for the other. 3. There is no Evidence at all from Antiquity, that Hoc facite hath any respect to the Eucharist as a Sacrifice, or to the making the Apostle's Priests. And so much is confessed by Estius, viz. that neither is this Exposition found in any ancient Writer, nor is it suitable to our Saviour's purpose. For, he saith, it is not absolutely said Facite, but Hoc facite, i. e. that which ye see me do, do ye likewise. So that still, by virtue of these Words, those who do receive Authority to administer, are bound to follow Christ's Example, and that as he did administer in both Kinds to all who were present, so ought they to do likewise. But there is one Exception yet more left, which is the last Reserve, viz. that although it be granted to be a Command, that the Cup should be administered to all, yet it is only a positive Command, binding in the general ; but yet it is of the Nature of all affirmative Precepts, that though it always binds, yet not at all times,

Suarez. in 3. Tom. 3. disp. 71. sect. 2.

Estius in l. 4. sentent. dist. 12. sect. 11.

times, but only in case of Necessity, of which Necessity the Church is the most competent Judge; and therefore if the Church do not think it necessary, then the Obligation ceases. To which I answer, 1. That upon this Ground it will be in the Churches Power to repeal or suspend all divine *positive Precepts* as well as this. For the Reason of this will hold for all others, which is, that they do not oblige, as they speak, *ad semper*, but only *semper*, i. e. not at all times, though they never cease to oblige. And therefore on this ground, for all that I can see, the Church may as well repeal the use of *Baptism*, or the *Eucharist* it self, as the *Communion in both Kinds*; all being of an equal Nature, as *affirmative Precepts*. But, Is it possible to imagine that *Christ* appointing *positive Institutions* in his Church, and giving *Precepts* and plain Directions about them, should yet leave it in the Power of any Men to reverse, alter, or suspend the Obligation to the Performance of those Commands? Did not he foresee all cases of Necessity, when he first appointed these Things, and, if notwithstanding that, he makes a plain Command, for the observance of them; What can such a pretended Power in the Church signifie, but an Authority to alter or repeal what she pleases in the *Laws of Christ*? 2. There is a great deal of Difference between the Nature of the Obligation of *affirmative Precepts*, and the prohibiting the use of something positively commanded. For, although *positive Precepts* do not bind at all Times, yet that reaches only to the thing it self, and not to the *Mod.* of Performance. Thus we say, That the *Eucharist* being a *positive Institution*, doth not oblige Men at all times to be Partakers of it; but if on that account any Church should undertake to forbid the Celebration of it, this were a direct Violation of the Law it self, and not an *Interpretation* of it in regard of Circumstances. And whatever Obligation of this Nature there is, it respects the whole Duty; But it doth by no means follow, that therefore in the Celebration the Church may declare what may be used, and what not. For the manner of Performance in case it be performed at all, is absolutely commanded; it is only the Performance in general, which is of the Nature of a *positive Precept*. Thus we say, Men are not bound to pray at all Times, though they be always bound to pray; but in case Men do pray, they are indispensably bound to pray as God hath required them to do it. So we say here, That Men are not bound at all times to administer, or receive the *Eucharist*; but, in case they do, they are indispensably bound to receive it according to *Christ's Institution*. So that this of *Communion in both Kinds*, relates to the manner of a *positive Precept*, and is not a distinct *positive Precept* by it self; and therefore is indispensable by any Authority of the Church. Besides, your Church doth nor meerly suspend the Exercise of this in case of Necessity, but forbids Men the doing it, which is a direct and wilful Violation of the *Institution of Christ*. And therefore the Question is not as it is strangely perverted by some of you, *Whether it be necessary at all Times to receive the Cup* (although even that be true in case of receiving at all) but, *whether it be in the Churches Power at all to prohibit the receiving it*; and this we say, and are ready to make good to be a Presumptuous Violation of the *Laws of Christ*, and an usurping an Authority which may as well extend to all *positive Institutions*. And thus I hope I have made that appear, which you say his Lordship should have done, viz. that *Christ did so institute the Sacrament of his last Supper, that he would not have one part to be administred without the other, nor one part to be taken without the other*.

§. 16.

The same I might also at large shew, from the Reasons of this Institution, that they do equally belong to the People, as well as the Priests, and that those Reasons are of a Nature as unalterable as the Institution it self; where-
by

by I should have shewed the Vanity of your Distinction of the *Eucharist* into a *Sacrament*, and a *Sacrifice*, and the Absurdity of your Doctrine of *Concomitancy*; but that would be too large for our present Design; and that which you give me not sufficient ground to enter upon, since the Obligation is sufficiently cleared from the *Institution* it self. I therefore proceed to shew, that the *Primitive Church* did always understand the *Communion* in both kinds to be an indispensable part of the *Institution* of *Christ*. Which one would think were evident enough from *S. Paul*, in his bringing the *Corinthians* back to the *Primitive Institution*, as that unalterable Rule which they were to observe. For if, because of some ill Customs which had obtained amongst them, he tells them, *This is not to eat the Lord's Supper*; How much more would he have said so, if there had been a mutilation of the *Parts* of it? And all along in his Discourse he supposes *Christ's Institution* to be the indispensable Rule which they ought to observe; *That which I have received of the Lord, I delivered unto you*: not, certainly, to leave it in their Power: Whether they would observe it or no, but to shew them, what their Duty was, and what they ought unalterably to observe. Else he would never have told them so much of the danger of *unworthy receiving*, in *eating the Bread, and drinking the Cup of the Lord unworthily*; For, Can we possibly think, that the Rudeness of their access to the *Lord's Table* was so great a Sin, and the Violation of his *Institution* to be none at all? The *Apostles* were such Strangers to the Doctrine of *Concomitancy*, that still both *eating and drinking* were supposed then, even by the most unworthy Receivers. There were then no such *Fears* of the *Effusion* of the *Blood of Christ*, or the Irreverence in receiving it, and much less of the *long Beards* of the *Laity*; which are the worshipful Reasons given by *Gerson* and others, why the People should not be admitted to the use of the *Chalice*. I do verily think the *Apostles* had as much care to preserve the due Reverence of the *Sacrament*, as ever the *Councils* of *Constance* or *Trent* had; but they thought it no way to preserve the Reverence of the *Sacrament*, by shewing so little to *Christ*, as not to observe his *Institution*. But you very kindly grant that which you knew was impossible to be denied, *viz. That in ancient Times, when, you say, the Number of Christians was small, it was the ordinary Custom for all that would (the Laity as well as others) to receive the Eucharist in both kinds; but, say you, we averr, this Custom proceeded meerly out of free Devotion, and not out of any Belief, that it was absolutely necessary so to do, by virtue of Christ's Precept*. It is no great matter what you *averr*, since you *averr* so monstrous a Doctrine of *Transubstantiation*, as confidently as you do this, and with much a like Reason. For I have shewed already, that the *Institution* of *Christ* in reference to this, is perpetually Obligatory, and that the *Apostles* look upon that as an *unalterable Rule*, and therefore your *averring* signifies nothing, when you never offer to prove what you *averr*. But, I pray tell me, By what means would you understand what *Precepts* are perpetually obligatory, which are not clear to our present purpose? If *positive Command, immutable Reason, universal Practice* of the *Church* may prove any thing so, we have all these plain and clear for *Communion* in both kinds. And not the least Suspicion or Intimation given, that they looked on it as a matter of *free Devotion*, but of *indispensable Necessity*. But, What mean you in saying, *When the number of Christians was small, they received it in both kinds*? Do *Christ's Institutions* vary according to the Numbers of *Communicants*? Hath not *Christ* the same Power to oblige many as a few? or, Do you think the Numbers of breakers of his *Institution* make the Fault the less? But, When was it the number of *Christians* was so small? Only in the *Apostles* times, or as long as the

2 Cor. ii. 20.

P. 2901

the Custom lasted of *communicating* in both Kinds? Do you think the number of *Christians* was so small in the *Primitive Times*? If you do, you lamentably discover your Ignorance in the *History* of those Times: Read the *Christian Apologies* over, and you will believe the contrary. But, Did this small number continue in the time of the *Christian Emperors*, eventill after a *thousand Years* after Christ? For so long the Communion in both Kinds continued so inviolably, that neither you, nor any before you, are able to produce one *Instance* of a publick and solemn Celebration of the *Eucharist* in the Church wherein the *People* did not communicate in both Kinds. And, Could a matter so indifferent as you suppose this to be, meet with no Persons all this time, who out of Reverence to the *Blood of Christ*, should deny giving it to the *People*? Nothing then but an unmeasurable Confidence, and a Resolution to say any thing, though never so false or absurd (if it tend to the Interest of your Church), could make you say, *That Communion in one kind was always, even in the first five or six hundred Years, allowed publicly as well in the Church, as out of it.* Than which, if you had studied it, you could scarce have uttered a *greater untruth*; and in which there are such *Multitudes* of your own Party bearing Witness against you. And *Bellarmin* is so far from helping you out in it, that he is extremely at a Loss to offer at any thing which hath any Tendency that way. But before we come to consider the *Instances* and *Exceptions* you make, we must somewhat further see, what the *Practice* and *Sense* of the Church was, that we may, the better judge, Whether Communion in both *Kinds* were looked on as a matter only of *free Devotion*, or as something necessary by virtue of *Christ's Institution*. And for this I shall not insist on those *Multitudes* of Testimonies, which manifest the *Practice* it self, but briefly touch at some few, which more directly prove, that what they did, was, Because in doing otherwise, they should have violated the *Institution* of Christ. To pass by therefore the Testimonies of *Justin Martyr*, *Irenaeus*, *Clemens Alexandrinus*, *Tertullian*, all clear for the *Practice*; the first I insist on, is that of *S. Cyprian* against those who gave Water in the *Chalice*, instead of Wine; for, whosoever doth but read the very Entrance of

Quamquam sciam Episcopos plurimos, Evangelicæ veritatis ac Dominicæ traditionis tenere rationem, nec ab eo quod Christus Magister & præcepit & gessit, humanâ & novellâ institutione decedere; tamen quoniam quidam vel ignoranter vel simpliciter in calice Dominico sanctificando, & plebi ministrando, non hoc faciunt quod Jesus Christus, Dominus & Deus noster, sacrificii hujus Auctor & Doctor, fecit & docuit; religiosum pariter ac necessarium duxi, has ad vos literas facere, ut si quis in isto errore adhuc teneatur, veritatis luce perspectâ ad radicem atque originem traditionis Dominicæ revertatur. Cyprian. Epist. 63.

that Epistle, will soon find that he looked on *Christ's Institution* in all the parts of it as *unalterable*. For (saith he) *although I know, that most Bishops do keep to that which agrees with the truth of the Gospel, and what our Lord hath delivered; and do not depart from that which Christ our Master hath commanded and practised: yet because some, either through Ignorance, or Simplicity, in sanctifying the Cup of our Lord, and delivering it to the People, do not that which Jesus Christ our Lord and God, the Author and Teacher of this Sacrifice, did and taught; I have thought it a necessary part of my Duty to write to you, that if any one continue in that Error, he may, by discovering the Light of Truth, return to the Root and Fountain of our Lord's Tradition.*

I insist on this Testimony, not only for the clearness of it, as to the Custom of giving the *Cup* to the *People*; but especially for the Evidence contained in it, of the *unalterable Nature* of the *Institution* of Christ. For that he looks on as the great Fault of them who ministred *Water* instead of *Wine*, that they therein departed from the Example and Precept of *Christ*. Now there cannot be produced any greater Evidence of any Obligation as to this, than there is as to the giving the *Cup* it self. For here is *Christ's Example* and *Institution* equally as to both of them, and that in the same Words, *Drink ye all of it.* If that were such a departing from the *Institution*

tion to alter the *Liquor*, would it not have been accounted as great, to take away the *Cup* wholly? For afterwards he adds, *If Men ought not to break the least of Christ's Commands, How much less those great ones which pertain to the Sacrament of our Lord's Passion, and our Redemption? Or to change it into any thing, but that which was appointed by him?* And if not to change the matter, certainly neither can it be lawful to order the *Administration* otherwise than *Christ* appointed. I know *Bellarmino* saith, *The Parity of Reason will not hold, because this is to corrupt the matter of the Sacrament*: but *S. Cyprian* doth not insist on that as his Reason, but the departing from the *Institution of Christ*, and this is done by one as well as the other. But he adds, *That there was a Precept for that, Do this.* And so say we, was there as plain for the other, *Drink ye all of this.* So that the Parity of Reason is evident for the one as well as the other. Upon the same ground doth *Pope Julius* afterwards condemn the using *Milk* instead of *Wine*, because contrary to *Christ's Institution*; and so he doth the dipping the *Bread in the Chalice*: From whence we infer, that they looked on *Christ's Example and Institution* in the *Administration* to be *unalterable*. But most expresse is the Testimony of *Pope Gelasius*, who finding some, from the Remainders of *Manichaeism*, did abstain from the *Cup*, gives expresse order, *That they who were infected with this odd Superstition, either should receive the whole Sacrament, or abstain wholly from it; because the dividing one and the same Mystery, cannot be done without great Sacrilege.* To this, *Bellarmino* tells us, two Answers are commonly given; one, *That these words are meant of Priests*; another, *That they relate only to those superstitious Persons*; but both of them are sufficiently taken off by the Reason assigned, which is not fetched either from their *Priesthood*, or *Superstition*, but only from the *Institution of Christ*, that it would be *Sacrilege* to part those things, which *Christ* by his *Institution* had joined together. Thus we see, the Sense of the *Church* is clear, not only for the *Practice*, but the *Command* too; and the sinfulness of the *Violation* of it. Although to you one would think it were wholly needless to prove any more than the *Universal Practice*, since the *Tradition* of the *Church* is equal with you, with an *unwritten Word*; but that is, when it makes for your purpose, and not otherwise. For in this case, though the *Institution* be expresse, the *universal Practice* of the *Church* for at least a Thousand Years unquestionable; yet because it contradicts the present Sense and Practice of your *Church*, all this signifies nothing at all with you. So true is it, that it is neither *Scripture* nor *Antiquity*, which you really regard, but *Interest* and the *Present Church*. And what *Cusanus*, like a downright Man, spake out in this case, is that you must all at last take sanctuary in, *That the Scriptures must be interpreted according to the current Practice of the Church*; and therefore it is no wonder if they be interpreted at one time one way, and another time another way. And though this seem a very great Absurdity, yet it is no more than is necessary to be said by such who maintain things so contrary to *Scripture*, and the Practice of former Ages of the *Church*.

But you are so far from thinking this contrary to the *Practice* of the *Church* in former Ages, that you say, *Not only in S. Thomas his Time, but in all Times of the Church, it was both publicly allowed, and commonly by some practised even in Churches, to receive under one kind only.* A bold Assertion, and which is confidently denied by very many of your own *Communion*. For not only *Cassander* often confesses, that for above a Thou-

De Euchar.
l. 4. c. 25.

Comperimus quod quidam, sumptis tantummodo corporis sacri portione, à calice sacri cruoris abstineant. Qui proculdubio (quoniam nescio-quâ superstitione docentur obstringi) aut Sacramenta integra percipiant, aut ab integris arceantur; quia divisio unius & ejusdem mysterii sine grandi sacrilegio non potest provenire. Apud Gratian. Comper. de Consecr. dist. 2.

Cusan. ep. 27.

§. 17.
P. 289.

Cassander de Commun. sub utraq; p. 1025, 1027, 1039. op. Paris.

Barns Catholico-Rom. Paris. scilicet. 7. lit. 8.

Ruard. Tapper. Tom. 2. p. 328. Alphons. à Castro. heres. 38. Lindan. Panop. l. 4. c. 56.

Aquinas p. 3. qu. 80. Art. 12.

Aquinas, c. Gentes, l. 4. cap. 61. Bonavent. l. 4. dist. 8. Art. 2. q. 2. Alensis, p. 4. q. 6. memb. 3. Art. 2.

P. Picherel. de Missa. c. 4.

Alens. p. 4. q. 31. memb. 1.

Alens. p. 4. q. 53. memb. 1.

and Years after Christ, no instance can be produced of publick Communion in one kind: But Father Barns acknowledges not only that Communion in both Kinds, is much more agreeable to Scripture, Fathers, and the Universal Church, but that *per se loquendo jure divino præscribitur*, taking it in it self, it is commanded by a Divine Law. But I know these Men are too honest for you to own them, but as to the universal Practice of the Church it is confessed by Ruardus, Alphonsus à Castro, Lindanus, and many others. But we need no more than your S. Thomas himself, even in that very place, where you say, *He rather makes for you, than against you*; for, when he says, that *Provide in quibusdam Ecclesiis observatur ut populo sanguis non detur, It was a Custom providently observed in some Churches, not to give the Sacrament in the Form of Wine to the Laity*; He thereby shews indeed, that in his time about A. D. 1260. this custom did in some Places obtain, but yet so, that the universal Practice had been to the contrary; for so much is confessed by him in his Commentaries on S. John, where his Words are, *secundum antiquam in Ecclesia consuetudinem omnes sicut communicabant corpori, ita communicabant & sanguini, quod etiam adhuc in quibusdam Ecclesiis servatur*. According to the ancient Custom of the Church, all did communicate in both kinds, which as yet is observed in some Churches. Now, Whether the Universal Practice of the Church in former times, or the Practice of some Churches in his time, were more agreeable to the Divine Institution, we may appeal to Aquinas himself, who elsewhere gives this Account, Why the Elements of Bread and Wine, were made use of, and delivered severally, *That they might denote a complete Refection, and fully represent the Death and Passion of our Saviour*. On the same Accounts Bonaventure and Alensis make both Kinds necessary to the Integrity of the Sacrament. And the latter (who was Master to the two former) says expressly, *That whole Christ is not contained Sacramentally under either kinds; but his Flesh under that of Bread, and his Blood under that of Wine*. Than which nothing can be more destructive to the Doctrine of Concomitancy. And it is learnedly proved by Pet. Picherellus, that the Bread was appointed to represent not the Body in its compleat Substance, but the meer Flesh, when the Blood is out of it, according to the Division of the Sacrifices into Flesh and Blood; from whence it appears, that the Sacrifice of Christ's Death cannot be represented meerly by one kind, and that whole Christ is not contained under one, in the Administration of it. And therefore Alensis rightly determines, that the *res Sacramenti* cannot be perfectly represented by one kind; and thence says, *He that receives but in one kind, doth not receive the Sacrament perfectly*. No wonder therefore that he tells us, *That some religious Persons in his time* (when the contrary Custom, through the Superstition of People, had somewhat prevailed) *did earnestly desire that the Sacrament might again be received in both Kinds*. Thus we see, when this Custom did begin, Reason and Argument was still against it, and nothing pleaded for it, but only some superstitious Fears of some accidental Effusions of the Blood of Christ. But you are the Man, who would still persuade us, *That Communion in one kind was not only publickly allowed, but by some practised even in Churches in all Times of the Church*. And therefore in Reason we must give Attendance to your impregnable Demonstrations of it. For otherwise, say you, *How is it possible that the Manichees should find Liberty and Opportunity to communicate amongst Catholicks in Catholick Churches, without being perceived, since they never drank Wine, nor communicated under the Form of Wine? as 'tis certain they frequently did in S. Leo's time, and after*. But you have very unhappily light of this for your first Proof, which is so evident against you. For Leo, who mentions the Manichees communicating in Catholick Churches,

Churches, tells the Catholics, What way they might discern them from themselves, viz. *that though they received the Bread, yet they refused the Wine; by which, saith he, you may discover their Sacrilegious Hypocrisie, and by that Means they may be expelled out of the Society of Catholics.* You were therefore very ill advised, to make choice of this for your Argument, which makes it plain, that all Catholics did receive in both Kinds, and that the Manichees might be thereby known that they did not. And if it were the Custom for the Catholics sometimes to receive in both Kinds, and sometimes not, (which is all the shift Belarmine hath) and the Manichees not at all, this could be no note of Distinction between them; for, although the Manichees might not receive at one time, they could not tell but they might at another. Now Leo's Intention being, to give such a Note of Distinction, that they might not receive at all among them, it evidently follows, that all the Catholics did constantly receive in both Kinds, and that they were only Manichees who did abstain from the Cup. For that Story which Belarmine insists on, and you refer to, of the Woman, who being a Macedonian Heretick, yet pretending to communicate with the Catholics, had the Bread which her Maid brought with her, and which she took instead of the Eucharist, turned into a Stone in her Mouth, upon which she runs presently to the Bishop, and with Tears confessed her Fault; as we take it wholly upon the Faith of Sozomen, from whom Nicephorus transcribes it, so I cannot imagine what it proves for your purpose, unless it be, that they in whose Mouths the Bread turns into a Stone too, will hardly have Patience till the Cup be administered to them. For so both Sozomen and Nicephorus relate it, that immediately upon her feeling it to be a Stone, she ran to the Bishop, and shewed him the Stone, acknowledging with Tears her Miscarriage. But besides this, you bring several Instances from the Communion of Hermits in the Wilderness, of Travellers on their Journeys, of sick Persons in their Beds, and private Communions in Houses, and lastly, little Children in the Church, and at Home in their Cradles, which communicated in Form of Wine only. And, Are not all these invincible Proofs, that there was a publick, solemn Administration of the Communion in one kind publicly allowed in Churches in all times? When you can prove that the Communion of Hermits was in the Church, or that they did not receive as well the Wine as the Bread in the Wilderness, or that such Communion was approved by the Church: That the Communion of Travellers was not meer Communion in Prayers, as Baronius and Albaspinæus assert, without any Participation of the Eucharist at all; or if it were, that it was only a Participation in one kind (against which Albaspinæus gives many Reasons :) That the Communion of the Sick was without Wine, when Justin Martyr saith, That both Bread and Wine were sent to the absent: when Eusebius tells us, That the Bread given to Serapion, was dipt; when S. Hierome saith of Exuperius, That he preserved the Blood in a Glass for the use of the Sick: That Private Communions were without Wine, since Gregory Nazianzen saith, his Sister Gorgonia, preserved both the Symbols of the Body and Blood of Christ; and Albaspinæus confesses, that one might be carried Home as well as the other: or that these were approved by the Church, since Durantus saith, That the use of private Communions coming up by Persecutions, were abrogated afterwards; and are expressly condemned by the Council of Cæsar-Augusta about the Year 381. and the first Council of Toledo, about A. D. 400. Lastly, that the Communion of Infants was only in one kind, either in the Church or at

Quum ad legendam infidelitatem suam nostris audeant interesse mysteriis, tam sacramentorum communione se temperant, ut interdum tutius lateant, ore indigno Christi corpus accipiunt, sanguinem autem redemptionis nostræ haurire omnino declinant. Quod ideo vestram volumus scire sanctitatem, ut vobis huiusmodi homines & hisce manifestentur indicii, & quorum deprehensa fuerit sacrilega simulatio, notari & proditi à sanctarum societate, sacerdotum auctoritate pellantur. Leo. Sermon. quadrages. 4.

Sozom. hist. l. 8. c. 5. Niceph. l. 13. c. 7.

Baron. An. 400. n. 67. Albaspinæ. observat. l. 1. c. 3. Justin. Martyr. Apol. 2. Euseb. hist. l. 6. c. 36. Hieron. ep. 4. Nazianz. Or. 1. Albaspinæ. obs. cap. 4. l. 1.

Durant. de ritib. Eccles. l. 2. c. 55.

Home, or that this *Communion of Infants* which the *Council of Trent* condemns, was a *due Administration* of the *Eucharist*: When I say you have proved all these Things, the utmost you can hence infer, is, only that in some rare Cases, and accidental Occasions, *Communion in one kind* was allowed of. But what is all this to the proving that the *stated, solemn Administration* of the *Eucharist in one kind* was ever practised, much less allowed, within a thousand Years after Christ. And yet if you could prove that, you fall short of vindicating your *Church*, unless you add this, which you never so much as touch at, *viz.* That it was ever in all that time thought lawful to forbid the Celebration of the *Eucharist* in both *Kinds*. Prove but this, which is your only proper Task, and I say as his Lordship doth in another case, *Tou shall be my Apollo for ever.*

¶ 18.
P. 276.

P. 290.

*De Missa, l. 2.
c. 10.
Sixtus Sen.
bibl. Annot.
152. l. 6.
Basil. ep. 64.
Theodoret. dia-
log. 3.*

We proceed to a fourth Error, which is the *Invocation of Saints* defined by the *Council of Trent*. As to which, that which his Lordship saith may be reduced to three Things. 1. *That those Expressions of the Fathers which seem most to countenance it are but Rhetorical Flourishes.* 2. *That the Church then did not admit of the Invocation of Saints, but only of the Commemoration of Martyrs.* 3. *That the Doctrine of the Roman Church makes the Saints more than Mediators of Intercession.* To these three I shall confine my Discourse on this Subject, and therefore shall follow you close in your Answers to them. For the first, When you are proving that the *Fathers Expressions* were not *Rhetorical Flourishes*, you would fain have your own accounted so. For, say you, *How can it seem to any that duly considers it, but most extremely partial and strange to term so many Exhortations, so many plain and positive Assertions, so many Instances, Examples, Histories, Reports and the like, which the Fathers frequently use, and afford in this kind (and that upon Occasions wherein dogmatical and plain Delivery of Christian Doctrine and Truth is expected) nothing but Flourishes of Wit and Rhetorick?* And after, you call these *meer Put-offs*, as before you had said, *That when any thing in the Fathers is against us, then it is Rhetorick only; when against you, then it is dogmatical and the real Sense of the Fathers.* But these are only General Words, fit only to deceive such who believe bold Affirmations sooner than solid Proofs. This is a thing must be tried by Particulars, because it is on both Sides acknowledged, that the *Fathers* did many times use their *Rhetorick*, and that such Things are uttered by them, in their *Panegyricall Orations* especially, which will not abide a severe Trial. Doth not *Bellarmino* confess that *St. Chrysostome* doth often *hyperbolize*, and *Sixtus Senensis* say as much of others, that in the heat of their Discourses they are carried beyond what they would have said in a strict Debate? But who are better Judges of these Things than the *Fathers* themselves? Are not they the Men, who have bid us distinguish what comes from them in a Heat, from that which they deliver as the Doctrine of the Church? Have not they told us, that the popular *Orations* uttered in Churches are no Rules of Opinion? Have not some of them, when they have seemed extream vehement and earnest, at last come off with this, *That they have been declaiming all that while?* Witness *S. Hierom* against *Helvidius*; and if you make not use of the same Rule to put a favourable Construction on his Books against *Jovinian*, *Vigilantius*, *Ruffinus* and others, you will as little be able to excuse him from strange Doctrines, as from intemperate Heats. What *put-off* then is it for us to say, that *S. Basil* in his *Oration* on *Mammas*, and the forty eight *Martyrs*; that *S. Gregory Nazianzen* in his *Panegyricall Orations* on *S. Basil*, *S. Athanasius*, *S. Cyprian*, his Sister *Gorgonia*. *S. Gregory Nyssen* in his Commendation of *Theodorus*, do make use of their *Rhetorick* in *Apostrophe's* to the Persons whom they praise,

Praise, without any solemn Invocation of them? What is there herein unsuitable to their present Purpose? Is it any more than *Orators* have commonly done? What strange thing is it then, that those great *Masters* of *Rhetorick* should make use of their Art to raise the People, not only to a high Esteem of their Persons, but of those Vertues which rendred them so Illustrious? Might not such Expressions by way of *Apostrophe* be still used by such who are furthest from the *Invocation* of *Saints*? Although by their Example we are taught how dangerous it is to indulge *Rhetorick* too much in such Cases. But as though they foresaw the ill Use would be made of them, they add such Expressions as sufficiently tell us, they made no solemn Invocation of them; *ἐν τῇ αἰδνῇ, ὡς οἱ μὲν*, and the like. Had these Persons a mind to deliver a Doctrine of *Invocation* of *Saints*, who speak with such *Hesitation* and doubt as to their Sense of what was spoken? (For, it is a groundless shift, to say, that those Expressions imply an Affirmation and not Doubt.) That which we say then, is this, That the Doctrine of the *Church* is not to be judged by such *Encomiastick Orations*, wherein such *Rhetorical Flourishes* are usual; and when you bring us their plain and positive Assertions, we will by no means give you that Answer, That those are *Flourishes of Wit and Rhetorick*. But his Lordship very well knew how far you were from any such dogmatical Assertions of the *Fathers* in this Point, and that the most plausible Testimonies which you had were taken out of those three great *Orators* in their *Panegyrics* in praise of their Friends, or of the *Martyrs*; and therefore it was he said, *Though some of the ancient Fathers have some Rhetorical Flourishes about it, for the stirring up Devotion (as they thought) yet the Church then admitted not of the Invocation of Saints.* That is it we stand on, that no such things was admitted by the *Church*, if we should yield that any particular (though great) Persons were too lavish in their Expressions this way; must these be the Standard which we must judge of the Doctrine of the *Church* by? We must consider the *Church* was now out of Persecution, and Ease and Honour attended that Profession of Christianity, for which such Multitudes had endured the Flames; and the People began to grow more loose and vain than when they still expected *Martyrdoms*: This made these great Men so highly commend the *Martyrs* in their popular Orations, not to propound them as *Objects of Invocation*, but as *Examples* for their *Imitation*. Thence they encouraged them to frequent the *Memoriæ Martyrum*, that by their Assemblies in those Places they might revive something of that pristine Heat of Devotion, which was now so much abated among them. But the Event was so far from answering their Expectation, that by this Means they grew by degrees to place much of their Religion, rather in honouring the former *Martyrs* and *Saints*, than in striving to imitate them in their Vertues and Graces. And from the frequenting the Places where the *Martyrs* were enshrined through the pretence of some ecstatical Dreams and Visions, or some rare Occurrences which they say happened at those Places, they began to turn their real Honour into superstitious Devotion, which at last ended in solemn *Invocation*. To which no small Encouragement was given when such Persons as *S. Hierom* and others, were so far from putting a stop to the growing Evil, that though they confessed many Miscarriages committed, yet they rather sought to palliate them and make the best Construction of them, still hoping that this Zeal in the People to the Honour of the *Martyrs* would promote Devotion among them; whereas it sunk gradually into greater Superstitions. This I take to be the truest and most faithful Account of those first Beginnings and Tendencies to *Invocation* of *Saints*, which appeared in the latter end of the fourth Century.

For

§. 19.

For before that time we meet with nothing that can bear the Face of any *positive and plain Assertions, Instances, Examples, Histories, or Reports tending that way*. Which is so clear, that *Cardinal Perron* after the best use of his Wit and Diligence to find out something to this Purpose within the three first Centuries, at last confesses, that in the Authors who lived nearer the *Apostles* times no Footsteps can be found of the *Invocation of Saints*. But when he gives this account of it, *That most of the Writings of that time are lost*, it makes us see what poor Excuses bad Causes will drive the greatest Wits to. For are not the Writings of *Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Clemens Alexandrinus, Origen, Tertullian, Cyprian, Arnobius, Lactantius* and others still extant, who were pious and learned men? And is it possible that such men should all of them conceal such a Doctrine as this, which would so easily appear in the Face of the Church? But it is well we have the Confession of so great a Man for the best Ages of the Church; and not only so, but he acknowledges withal, *That there is neither Precept nor Example for it in the Scripture*. Which others not only assert, but offer to give Reasons for it, for the Old Testament: *Because the Fathers were not then admitted to the beatifical Vision*: and for the New Testament, *Because the Apostles were men of such Piety and Humility, that they would not admit of it themselves, and therefore made no mention of it in their Writings*; and withal, *Because in the beginning of Christianity there would have been a Suspicion, that they had only changed the Names of Heathen Deities, and retained the same kinds of Worship*. These for the new Testament we admit of, not as *Rhetorical Flourishes*, but as *plain and positive Assertions* which contain a great deal of Truth and Reason in them. So that here is a confessed Silence as to this Doctrine throughout all the Story of *Scripture*, and for 300 Years and more after Christ; and in all this time we meet with no such *assertions, instances, examples, reports*, and the like, which tend to establish this new Doctrine. But instead of this, we meet with very *plain Assertions* to the contrary, back'd with strong and invincible Reasons; and herein not to insist on those Places in *Scripture* which appropriate *Invocation to God* only, and that in regard of his incommunicable Attributes of *omniscience*, and *infinite Goodness and Power*, Which are the only Foundations given in *Scripture* for *Invocation*: not to mention those Places, where all Tendencies to such kind of *Worship* of any created Being, are severely checked; and wherein an *Inferior* and relative *Worship* is condemned on this Account, *Because all Worship is due to God only*; and wherein that very Pretence of *Humility*, in not coming to *God*, but through some Mediator is expressly spoken against; nor to enlarge how much this Doctrine of *Invocation of Saints* is injurious to *God*, by giving that *Worship* to Creatures which belongs only to himself, and how repugnant it is to *Divine Worship*, that Prayers should be made to *Saints* for them to intercede with *God*, when they cannot know what those Prayers are till *God* reveals them; nor how dishonourable it is to *Christ*, both in regard of his *Merits* and *Intercession*; nor how great a Check it is to true *Piety* to put men to pray to them, whom they can have no ground to believe do hear or regard their Prayers, and in the mean time to take them off from their serious and solemn Addresses to *God*. Not to insist, I say, on these Things, because I design no set Discourse on this Subject, which hath been so amply handled by so many already; I shall only discover the Sense of the *Primitive Church* in this particular by two things, the one of which takes in the first three Centuries, and the other extends a great deal further: From which I doubt not, but to make it evident how far the *Invocation of Saints* was from being received then. The first is, from the Answers given to the *Heathens*, when it was objected against the *Christians* that they did worship dead Men and Angels. I confess,

Eckius in En-
chirid. cap. 5.
Salmeron. in
1 Tim. 2. disp.
8. Pers. de
Tradit. p. 3.

confess, some have been so subtle as from hence to infer, *that they did it*; or else, say they, the *Heathens* would never have charged them with it. But they who read the *Christians Apologies* will find far more unreasonable things than this laid to their charge, and I hope they will not say, there must be an equal ground for all the other Imputations also. But it seems they more believe the *Heathens Objections* than the *Christians Answers*, who utterly disavow any such thing. The first mention we find of any such Imputation, is in that excellent Epistle of the *Church of Smyrna* to the *Church of Philomylium* concerning the Martyrdom of *Polycarp*, wherein they tell us; how some suggested to *Nicetas*, that he should desire the *Proconsul* that *Polycarp's* Body might not be granted to the *Christians*; Lest, say they, *they should leave to worship Him that was Crucify, and worship him*; to which they return this excellent Answer. *They are ignorant that we can never be induced to forsake Christ, who suffered for the Salvation of all who shall be saved of the whole World, or to worship any other for him being the Son of God we adore. But the Martyrs as the Disciples and Followers of the Lord, we love worthily for their exceeding great Affection toward their own King and Master, of whom we wish that we may be Partners and Disciples.* Can any thing be more express than this is, to shew what Difference they put between Christ and the *Martyrs*? Not that they worshipped one as God with an absolute direct Worship, and the other as subordinate Intercessors, with a relative and indirect Worship, as you would have told them; but they worshiped Christ and none but him, because he was the *Son of God*; but for the *Martyrs*, they loved them indeed, but they worshiped them not at all, for so much is implied in the *Antithesis* between that and their Worship of Christ. So that these Words are exclusive of any kind of Worship which they gave to the *Martyrs*; for they were so far from giving them that Worship which belonged to the *Son of God*, that they only expressed their Love to them, without giving them any Worship. And in the old Latin Translation of this Epistle, of which there are two MSS. extant in *England*; when they say, *They can worship none else but Christ*, it is there rendred, *Neque alteri cuiquam precem orationis impendere, Nor impart the Supplication of Prayer to any other.* As the late learned Lord *Primate Usher* hath observed; which utterly destroys the Doctrine of *Invocation*.

We proceed further to see what Account *Origen* gives of the *Christian Doctrine* touching *Invocation* in his Answer to *Celsus*, wherein he had sufficient Occasion given him to declare the Sense of the Church at that time. And if he had known or approved any relative Worship given to *Angels* or *Saints*, it is not conceivable that he should express himself in such a manner as he doth. For when *Celsus* enquires what kind of *Beings* they thought *Angels* to be, *Origen* answers, that although the *Scripture* sometimes calls them *Gods*, it is not with that Intention that we ought to worship them. For, saith he, *all Prayers, and Supplications, and Intercessions, and Thanksgivings are to be sent up to God the Lord of all, by the High Priest who is above all Angels, being the living Word and God. For to call upon Angels (we not comprehending the knowledge of them, which is above the reach of man) is unreasonable. And supposing it were granted that the knowledge of them, which is wonderful and secret, might be comprehended: this very*

Ἀγνοοῦντες ὅτι ἐπεὶ τὸν Χριστὸν ποιεῖ καὶ ἅλιον πᾶν δυνάμεθα, τὸν ὑπὲρ τῶν πάντων κόσμου τῶν σωζομένων σωτήριον παθόντα, ὅτι ἐπεὶ πᾶσι σώσειν. τὸν μὲν γὰρ οὐδὲν τὰ θεῶν προσκυνοῦμεν. τὰς δὲ μαρτύρας, ὡς μαθητὰς τοῦ κυρίου καὶ μιμητὰς, ἀγαπῶμεν ἀξίως, ἐκκαὶ νοίας ἀντιπροσέχοντες εἰς τὸν ἰδιον βασιλέα καὶ διδάσκαλον ὡς γένοιτο καὶ ἡμεῖς συγκοινωνῆς τε καὶ συμμεθητὰς γενέσθαι. Apud Euseb. hist. Eccles. l. 4. c. 15. ed. Valef.

Answer to the Jesuits Chall. p. 428. §. 20.

Πᾶσαν μὲν γὰρ δέησιν, καὶ προσκυτῶ, καὶ ἐνδοξάζω καὶ εὐχαριστῶ ἀντιπροσέχον τῷ πᾶσι σώσειν διὰ τὸ ἐπὶ πάντων ἀγγέλων ἀρχιερεῖς, ἐμφύχου λόγου, καὶ θεοῦ. Ἀγγέλους γὰρ καλεῖται μὴ ἀγαλᾶξοντες τῷ ὑπὲρ ἀνθρώπων περὶ αὐτῶν ἐπιστήμην, ἐκ ὑλοπορῶν. ἵνα δὲ καὶ ὑπόθεσιν ἢ περὶ αὐτῶν ἐπιστήμην, θαυμαστὸς περὶ σοῦ καὶ ἀπόρρητος καὶ ἀκατήχητος. αὗτοι ἢ ἐπιστήμην, παρεσῆκασα τῷ φῶσιν αὐτῶν καὶ ἐφ' οἷς εἰσὶν ἕκαστοι κληρονομοὶ ἐστέι ἄλλω διαρρεῖν εὐχεσθαι ἢ τῷ πρὸς πᾶσα διαρεῖ (διαρεῖ καὶ leg. Usher.) ἐπὶ πᾶσι θεῶν, διὰ τὸ Σωτήριον ἡμῶν οὐκ εἶναι τὸ θεῶν. Orig. c. Celsi, l. 5. p. 233. ed. Cantab.

Knowledge

Knowledge declaring their Nature to us, and the charge over which every one of them is set, would not permit us to presume to pray unto any other but God the Lord of all, who is abundantly sufficient for all, by our Saviour the Son of God. In which Testimony, we clearly see what the Judgment of the Church then was concerning *Invocation*: For in a matter of *Divine Worship* equally concerning the whole Church, we have no Reason to imagine that *Origen* should deliver any private Opinion of his own. And herein we are plainly told, That all Prayers and Supplications are to be made to God only through Christ, that in such cases where we are Ignorant of the nature of Beings, it is unreasonable for us to pray to them (as we certainly are concerning separated Souls as well as Angels); that in case we did know them, yet it would not be reasonable to pray to them, both because they are inferior and ministring Spirits, and that God himself is abundantly sufficient for all through Christ. Now let any reasonable Man judge, whether these Arguments do not hold as well against a relative and subordinate Invocation, as absolute and Sovereign. But no such Distinctions were thought of then. For they judged all Prayer and Invocation, by the very Nature of it, to import Divinity in that it was made to, and therefore that no created Beings how excellent soever were capable of it. From whence *Origen* afterwards supposing the Sun, Moon, and Stars to be Intellectual Beings, gives this account, Why, notwithstanding that, they made no Prayers to them. For, saith he, since they offer up Prayers themselves to God through his only Son, *κελούμεν μὴ δὲν ἐννοῦναι τοῖς ἐννοούμενοις*, we judge that we ought not to pray to them that pray, Since they would rather send us to God whom they pray to, than bring us down to themselves, or to divide our praying virtue from God, to themselves. Can we then suppose that the Church at that time did allow of Prayers to be made to Saints in Heaven, supposing their praying there in behalf of the Church on Earth? For we see *Origen* goes on this ground, that all Intellectual Spirits which pray themselves, are not to be prayed to; and that if they knew of our praying to them, they would send us to God and not accept of those Supplications to themselves which are due only to God. In the beginning of the eighth Book, *Celsus* disputes against the Christians because they worship only the Supreme God, without giving any to the Inferior Demons; and that upon this ground, because, saith he, They who worship the Inferiour Gods, acknowledging them Inferiour, is so far from dishonouring the Supreme, that he doth that which is acceptable to him *Διὸν τιμῶν καὶ σέβων τὰς ἐκείνους πάντας, ἡ λυπεῖ τὸν θεόν, ἢ πείσσει αὐτόν*. For he that honours and worships those who are subject to him, doth not displease God whose they are all. These are *Celsus* his Words; from whence we are to take notice, that *Celsus* doth not plead for absolute and Sovereign Worship to be given to these Inferiour Deities or Spirits, but only a relative and subordinate Worship. So that if the Controversie had been between *Celsus* and a modern Romanist, all that *Celsus* here says must have been confessed on both Sides, and the whole Dispute only have been concerning those Demons or Spirits which were to have this relative and inferiour kind of Worship, viz. Whether those which *Celsus* call'd Demons, or only the Blessed Spirits and glorified Saints. But *Origen* who went upon other Grounds, returns a far different Answer; For, saith he, it is not lest we should hurt God that we abstain from the Worship of any but God according to this Word (*ἐκκλίνομεν τὸ ἀναδέναι ἄλλῃ πλὴν ἡ τοῦ θεοῦ*, to render the inferiour Worship of *Δουλεύειν* to any but God) but lest we should thereby hurt our selves, by separating our selves from our Portion in God. And the reason he gives why Christ is to be worshipped is, from that Divinity which manifested it self in him, and because of the Unity of Nature between God and him.

And

l. 5. p. 238.

L. 8. p. 381.

P. 383.

P. 384.

P. 385.

And although Origen saith, *That in some sense we may be said θεαποδιδόναι to give some kind of worship to Angels and Archangels; yet he saith the Sense of the Word must be purg'd, and the Actions of the Worshippers distinguished. Yet in the following Words he attributes that Worship which is by Supplication only to God and his only Son. So that still he reserves the offering up our Prayers as the appropriate worship to God himself, through his only Son. For to him, saith he, we first offer them, intreating him who is the propitiation for our sins, that he would vouchsafe as our high Priest to offer our Prayers, Sacrifices, and Intercessions to God over all. Therefore our Faith is only in God through his Son, who hath confirmed it to us. And afterwards, Away (saith he) with Celsus his Counsel, that we should worship Demons or inferior Spirits not taking them in the worst Sense) μὴν γὰρ προσευκτόν τῷ ἐν πᾶσι θεῷ, for we must only pray to God over all, and to the Word of God, his only begotten, and first born of all Creatures; and we must entreat him, that he as High Priest, would present our Prayer, when it is come to him, unto his God, and our God, and unto his Father, and the Father of them that frame their Life according to the Word of God. To the same Purpose again in another Place; To whom we offer our first-fruits, to him we direct our Prayers, having a High Priest, who is entered into Heaven, Jesus the Son of God; and we hold fast this Confession while we live, through the Favour of God, and his Son, who is manifested to us: And after saith, That the Angels help forward their Salvation, who call upon God, and pray sincerely, to whom they themselves also pray. But not one word of any praying to them, but only to God through Christ. For as he saith elsewhere. We must endeavour to please God only, who is over all, and pray that he may be propitious to us, procuring his good Will with Piety, and all kind of Virtue. But if he will yet have us to procure the good Will of any others, after him that is God over all; let him consider, that as when the body is moved, the motion of the shadow doth follow it: so in like manner, having God favourable to us, who is over all, it followeth that we shall have all his Friends, both Angels, and Souls, and Spirits, favourable to us. For they have a sympathy with them, that are thought worthy to find favour with God. Neither are they only favourable unto such as be worthy; but they co-operate with them also that are willing to serve God over all, and are friendly to them, and pray with them, and intreat with them. So as we may be bold to say, that when Men, who with a Resolution, propose to themselves the best Things, do pray unto God, many Thousands of the sacred Powers pray together with them uncalled upon. Here indeed we find that Saints and Angels do interceed in Heaven in behalf of the Saints on Earth, but that is not the Thing in dispute between us: But here we find no such thing at all as an Invocation of them; but he says, *They pray together with us*, when we pray to God himself, not when we pray first to them to pray with us. For this Origen makes to be wholly needless; for if God be propitious to us, so will all the Sacred Powers be too. So that still we find in Origen, that Invocation was only to be made to God over all, although he saith, *That with those who do sincerely call upon God, the Holy Spirits do joyn**

D d d d

with

Ἀλλὰ τὸν ἐν θεῷ καὶ τὸν ἐν υἱῷ αὐτοῦ καὶ λόγον καὶ ἐκείνους καὶ τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἡμῶν ἰκατέως καὶ δέξασθαι σέβειν, προσευκτόν τῷ θεῷ τῶν ὁρίων τὰς ἀρχὰς καὶ τὰς μὲν καὶ αὐτὰ. Orig. l. 8. p. 386.

Therefore our Faith Id. Ibid.

Id. p. 395.

Id. p. 400.

Ἐν τὸν ἐπὶ πᾶσι θεῷ ἡμῶν ἐξευμενίσαι, καὶ τὰτοι ἰλέω εὐχέων ἐξευμενίσαι, καὶ δέξασθαι καὶ πᾶσαν ἀρετὴν εἰς καὶ ἄλλους πινὰς βεβαίαι μετὰ τὸν ἐπὶ πᾶσι ἐξευμενίσαι θεῷ καθάποισιν ὅτι ὅταν τὸ πᾶν κινήσῃ σώματι ἀκολουθεῖ ἡ τῆς σκιάς αὐτῆς κίνησις, τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον καὶ ἐξευμενίσαι τὸν ἐπὶ πᾶσι θεῷ, ἐπειτα δὲ μενεῖς ἔχον τὰς ἐκείνους παύσαι φίλους ἀγγέλους, καὶ ψυχὰς, καὶ πνεύματα συναϊδοῦν γὰρ τῶν ἀξίων τὸ παρὰ τῷ θεῷ εὐμενίσαι, καὶ μόνον καὶ αὐτὸς εὐμενέει τῶν ἀξίων γινώσκων, ἀλλὰ καὶ συμπράττει τοῖς βλαπομένοις τὸν ἐπὶ πᾶσι θεῷ θεραπεύειν, καὶ ἐξευμενίσαι, συνευχόμενοι, καὶ συναξάντες ὥστε τὴν ἡμᾶς λέγειν, ὅτι ἀνθρώποις, μετὰ προσκλήσεως προσβλημένοις τὰ κρείττονα, ἀρχαίοις τῷ θεῷ, μνησθαι ὅτι ἀκαίρως συνευχόμενοι δύναμεις ἔσονται. Orig. l. 8. p. 420.

Ar nob. l. 3.

with them. To the same Purpose *Arnobius* speaks, when the *Heathens* asked, Why they did not worship any *Inferior Gods*? *satis est nobis*, saith he, *Deus primus, the Supreme God is sufficient for us.* In hoc omne quod colendum est colimus; quod adorari convenit adoramus, quod obsequium venerationis poscit, venerationibus promeremur. *In worshipping him, we worship all that is to be worshipped; we adore all, that is fit to be adored; we procure Favour by shewing Reverence to all that require it.* Where we are still to take notice, that the *Heathens* did not blame them for not giving the highest kind of *Worship* to these *Inferior Deities*, but for not worshipping them with the *subordinate and relative Worship*, which they said belonged to them. Now when in the Answer he saith, *That in worshipping God, they worshipped all that was to be worshipped;* he utterly destroys any such *Relative Worship*, which may be given to *Inferior Spirits*.

Q. 21.

Bellarmin. de
Sanct. beatitu.
L. I. c. 12.

For we are to consider, that the *Heathens* themselves did not give the same kind of *Adoration* to their *Heroes*, and *Inferior Deities*, which they did to him whom they accounted *Supreme*. And, setting aside the Difference of the Object, I can find no possible Difference between the *Invocation* of *Saints* in the Church of *Rome*, and that of *Dæmons* among the *Heathens*. And although *Bellarmino* hath taken the greatest Pains to clear the Nature of that *Worship*, which is given to *Saints*; yet, upon a thorow Examination of it, we shall find that all his Pleas would have held as well for the *Worship* of *Dæmons* in the *Platonists* Sense of them, as they do for the *Worship* of *Saints* among *Christians*. Three Things he tell us *Adoration* consists in, *An Act of Understanding* apprehending some Excellency: *An Act of the Will*, whereby we are inwardly inclined to do something by an internal, or external Act, by which we declare our Sense of that Excellency, and our Subjection to it; and lastly, *An external Act*, in which we bow or kneel, or shew some outward Sign of Subjection. Now of these three he saith, the *second* is most proper and essential, because the first may be without *Adoration*, and the last with *Irrifion* of that we pretend to worship. Further he observes that there are so many sorts of *Adoration* or *Worship*, as there are Degrees of Excellency, of which he reckons three kinds, *Divine*, *Humane*, and *between both*, as the *Grace* and *Glory* of the *Saints*: And that these several sorts of *Worship*, according to these several Excellencies, are not *univocal*, but *analogical*; and that they may be very well distinguished by the *internal Acts*, for the Inclination of the Will is greater or less, according to the Degree of Excellency apprehended in the Object. But as to the *External Acts*, it is not easie to distinguish them; for, almost all *External Acts*, (*sacrifice* only, and the Things referring to it excepted) are common to all kinds of *Adoration*. This is the Substance of what he hath, for explaining the Nature of *Divine Worship*: And by which I cannot possibly see, but that kind of *Worship* which was given by the *Heathens* to their *Dæmons*, was defensible upon the same Grounds that the *Invocation* of *Saints* is now. For as these apprehend a greater Excellency in *God*, than in the *Saints*; so did they in the *Supreme God*, than in those *Inferiour Deities*; which they did not acknowledge to have an *Infinite Nature* in themselves, but only that they had the *Honour* of being solemnly worshipped bestowed upon them. But this will be much clearer in the Case of the *Heroes*, or the *Apotheosis* of the *Roman Emperors*, as *Augustus* for Instance. The *Roman Senate* decrees, that *divine Honours* shall be given to *Augustus*? we cannot think, that by Virtue of this Decree he assumed a *Divine Nature*, or became absolutely *God*, so that the *Act* of the *Understanding* was of the same Nature, which it would have been, supposing some *Roman Catholick* should

should believe *Augustus* to have been a *Saint*: On which Supposition, we will suppose a *Heathen* and him to be at their *Prayers* together to him. I pray now tell me, Wherein lies the Difference, that one is *Idolatry*, and the other is not? For neither of them suppose him to be the *Supreme God*, both look on him as having a *middle kind of Excellency between God and Man*, the *external Actions* are the same in both, and their Apprehensions of Excellency being equal, the *Inclinations* of their *Wills* to testify their Devotion must be equal too. If you answer me, that one looks on him as a *Saint*, and the other doth not; I may soon tell you, that is nothing to the Purpose, for, the Question is not, Whether he was a *Saint* or no, but, Whether the Apprehension of a *middle Excellency between Divine and Humane*, with a correspondent Inclination of the *Will*, testified by external *Acts of Adoration*, be *Idolatry* or no? If it be *Idolatry* in the one, it must be in the other; for the *ratio formalis* is the same in both, viz. the Apprehension of an Excellency between *Divine* and *Humane*: For we are not enquiring, Whether the Apprehension be true or false, but, What the Nature of that *Act of Religion* is, which is consequent upon such an Apprehension. Now if it were not *Idolatry* in him, that believed *Augustus* to be a *Saint*, and worshipped him; How can it be made appear to be so in him, that believed him *deified*, or that *Divine Honours* did belong to him? And if this be granted; for my part, I cannot tell how you can excuse the *Primitive Christians*, that would rather suffer *Martyrdom*, than worship the *Heathen Emperors*; for, although they all thought it *Idolatry*, yet upon these Principles it could not be so; but the worst that could be made of it, was this, That the *Senate* took that upon it, which it had nothing to do with, because it belonged to the *Pope* to Canonize Men, and not to the *Roman Senate*. For, let me put it seriously to you, Whether you do not attribute the very same kind of *Authority* to the *Pope* now, which the *Roman Senate* challenged in the *apostles*, of the *Roman Emperors*? For, whosoever will compare the Rites of *Canonization* in *Bellarmino* with the ancient Rites of the *apostles*, will find them exactly answering to each other. For, 1. They are put in a Catalogue of *Saints*, and must be owned by all for such. 2. *Invocantur in publicis Ecclesiæ precibus*, They are prayed to in the publick Prayers of the Church. 3. *Temples and Altars for their sake, are dedicated to God*. 4. The *Sacrifices of the Eucharist*, of *Prayers*, and *Praises*, are publickly offered to God for their Honour; and then follow their *Festivals*, *Images*, *Reliques*, &c. What was there more done then, that publick *Divine Honours* were made to the *Deified Emperors*; not that these *Honours* were wholly terminated upon them, but they thought the giving of this relative Honour to them, did redound to the greater Honour of the *Supreme Deity*? So that we see, a new object of *Divine Worship* is solemnly appointed, upon the *Pope's Canonizing a Saint*; and no Pretence can be made to excuse this from *Idolatry*, which would not have excused all those *Heathens* from it, who believed there was one *Supreme Deity*, and yet allowed *Divine Honours* to be given to such *Spirits* which were employed by him, or attended on him. So that if the Notion of *Idolatry* must only lie in such an act of the *Will*, which results from an Apprehension of *Infinite Excellency*, which is only in the *Supreme Being*; very few, if any, of the more intelligent *Heathens* were ever guilty of it. But if the formal Reason of their *Idolatry* lay in offering up those *Devotions to that which was not God*, which only belong to an *Infinite Being*; I see not, but the same Charge will hold on the same Grounds, against those who *Invoke Saints* with those *external Acts of Devotion*, which are confessed to be the same with those where-with we call on God. But nothing can be more unreasonable, than that

Bellarmino should except *Sacrifices*, and things belonging thereto, from being common to the first and second sort of *Adoration*, and not except *Invocation*. For, Is it possible to conceive any Act which doth more express our sense of an *Infinite Excellency*, and the Profession of our *Subjection* to it, than *Invocation* doth? Which doth it far more than *Sacrifice* doth; for that being a meer external Act, is consistent with the greatest Mockery of *God*; but *solemn Invocation* implies in its own Nature our Dependence upon *God*, and an Acknowledgement of his *Infinite Knowledge* and *Power*. For *Invocation* lies chiefly in the internal Acts, and denotes primarily the inward desire of obtaining something from a *Being* above our own: So that, though I should grant the meer external Acts of *bowing* and *kneeling* to be common to *Adoration* given to *infinite* and *finite Perfections*; yet I utterly deny that these Acts are common to both, when the *Circumstances* do determine the *End* and design of them. As no Man by the meer bowing of *Abraham* to the *Children of Heth* could tell, whether it were civil or divine *Adoration* which he meant; but none who understood all the *Circumstances* of it, would have any Reason to question it. But, suppose it had been declared before, that these Men expected a more than *civil Adoration*, and that all the Rites of *solemn Invocation* which *Abraham* at any time used to *God*, must be used to them too; then the same external Acts must have received a new Denomination. So that though the meer external Acts be common to *civil* and *religious Worship*, yet as those Acts are considered with their several *Circumstances*, they are appropriated to one or the other of them. Thus, though a Man may use the same form of *Words* to an *Emperor* on his *Throne*, and the same external *Posture*, which he doth use after his *Death* in a *Temple* consecrated to him; yet in the one they are meerly Signs of *Civil Worship*, but in the other they become Testimonies of *Religious Adoration*. So, although in the *Invocation* of *Saints*, no other Words were used, but such as denote them to be *Creatures* still; yet if they be used with all the Rites of *solemn Invocation*, in Places appropriate to *Divine Worship*, and in *Sacred Offices*, they thereby declare the *Adoration* intended to be greater than any meer *Creature* is capable of. For we must consider, that as *God* is owned to be *Infinite* in himself, and to have incommunicable Perfections, so by reason of them there ought to be some appropriated Acts or Signs of *Worship*, to declare our *Subjection* to him; which being determined for this end, either by the *Law of God*, or the *Consent* of People, the attributing of them to any else but him, is a publick *Violation* of his *Honour*. Although in so doing, Men profess that they intend them only as Expressions of a lower kind of *Worship* than is due to the *Supreme Being*. But in such cases the *Protestation* avails not, where the *Fact* is evident to the contrary. For when Men in the most solemn manner, in publick places of *Devotion*, and in *sacred Offices*, do invoke *Saints*, and yet think they dishonour not *God* by it, because they say, they do not worship them as *God*; it is just as if a Man should upon all Occasions, in the *Presence-Chamber*, address himself to one of the *King's* Subjects as to the *King* himself; and being questioned for it, should only say, he did not dishonour the *King* by it, because he meant it not to him as a *King*, but as a *Subject*. But by so much is the *Dishonour* greater, because the *Sovereignty* of the *King* doth require that the Rights of *Majesty* should not be given to any *Subject* whatsoever. So that it is but a vain Pretence, when Men use all the Expressions whereby we declare our Sense of the *Infinite Perfections* which are in *God*, to any *Creatures*, to say, *They give them not that Worship which belongs to God*, meerly because they do believe they are *Creatures* still. But, Is it possible for Men to give the Honour which is due to *God*, to the *Creatures*, acknowledging them to be *Creatures* still? or,

Is it not? If not, then none of the *Heathens* could be guilty of *Idolatry*, in worshipping *Dæmons*, *Heroes*, and *Deified Emperors*; if it be possible, then the acknowledging the *Saints* not to be *God*, cannot excuse Men from the same kind of *Idolatry*, in the *Invocation* of them. And it is as frivolous a Plea which is made for those Forms of *Invocation* which are made to the *Saints* in plain Terms, not to intercede with *God* for them, but to bestow upon them both temporal and spiritual *Blessings* (of which Multitudes have been produced by our Writers) viz. *That though the Form of Words be the same that is used to God, yet the Sense is wholly, that they would pray to God to bestow them.* For, How should any other Sense be understood, when these Forms are allowed in *Invocation*? For, although the *Scripture* may sometimes attribute the effect to the subordinate *Instrument*, as when *S. Paul* is said to save some, yet certainly the *Scripture* is far from allowing such a Liberty in solemn *Invocation*: For upon this Ground it might have been lawful for Men to have fallen down upon their Knees to *S. Paul*, and have intreated him to save them. Do you think *S. Paul* would have approved such Phrases in *Invocation*? So that it is not the meer Phrase, but as it is joined with all Rites of *Invocation*, which makes it look so like the most gross *Idolatry*. When you pray to the *Virgin Mary*, to protect you from your Enemies, and receive you in the hour of Death, and to the *Apostles*, to heal your spiritual Maladies, which Forms are acknowledged by *Bellarmino*; Can any reasonable Man think, that the meaning of them only is, that they would pray to *God* to do these things for them? If one should bring his *Petition* to a *Courtier* for his *Pardon*, and in plain Terms beg that of him which the *King* only can grant: What Man that had his Wits about him, would ever imagine that he only meant by it, that he would entreat the *King* to do it for him? But *God* is more jealous of his Honour, than to be put off by such *Mockeries* as these are: Nay, when your great Men at the end of their most elaborate Works conclude with a *Laus Deo & beatissima Virgini*, What can be meant by it, but the attributing an Honour of the same kind to the one as the other? And when Prayers are made to *Saints*, that through their *Merits* they would do such things for them, it is hard conceiving the meaning should only be, that they would pray to *God* for them. Nay, some have expressly said, That *God* hath communicated that which of right belonged to him because of his *Divinity* and *Omnipotency*, to the blessed *Virgin*, and the *Saints*; and, that which is more wonderful, to their Images too. So *Gulielmus Fabricius* in his Approbation of *Lipsius* his *Divia Virgo Hallensis*, which it is thought by some that *Lipsius* only writ in Imitation of some *Heathen Goddesses*; which may be a very probable account of that otherwise very unhappy Undertaking of that learned Man. And as

one said of the *Pen* he offered to the *Virgin*, Nothing could be lighter, unless it were the Book he wrote with it.

But that professed Critick understood well enough the Exactness of the parallel of the *Worship* of the *Virgin*

Mary, with that of the *Heathen Goddesses*; and therefore very suitably calls her *Tutelar Diva*, by which his meaning might be guessed at, as *Plato's* was, by his using the Name of *God*, or *Gods*. But however that be, we are sure the parallel is so great between the *Worship* of *Saints* in the Church of *Rome*, and that of *Heroes* and *Dæmons* amongst the *Heathens*, that if one be justified, the other cannot be condemned, and if one be condemned, the other cannot be justified. So that from hence it follows, that the Arguments used by the *Primitive Christians* against that *Worship*, will hold against *Invocation* of *Saints*; because the *Heathens* pleaded not for an absolute and sovereign *Worship* of them, but only such a kind of

Relative

Bell. de Sanct.
beat. l. 1. c. 17.

Post Tacitum exactum, consummatosq; labores
Pennam Lipsiades hanc tibi, Diva, dicat.
Nil potuit pennâ levius tibi Diva dicare,
Ni fuerit levius quod tibi scribit opus.

relative and subordinate Worship, as you profess to be due to *Saints*. Thus much may suffice to clear the Notion of *Worship* in the *Primitive Church*, and to shew, how far that was from approving your Doctrine of the *Invocation of Saints*.

2. 22.
Athanas. Orat.
4. Cont. Arrian.
Greg. Nyssen.
Orat. 4. Cont.
Eunom.
Novatian, de
Trin. c. 14.

Aug. de Civit.
Dei l. 22. c. 10.

P. 291.

The next Argument I intended to have insisted on, should have been the proving the *Divinity of Christ* from the *Invocation* of him, as *Athanasius* and several others do; which could signify nothing, if *Invocation* were then allowed to *Saints*. But this hath been so amply managed by others, and the Sense of the *Church* having been sufficiently discovered by our precedent Discourse; I shall not need to insist any more on those foregoing Times, but now come to that Age of the *Church*, wherein the Honour of the *Martyrs* seems to be advanced higher upon the ceasing of *Persecution*. But still his Lordship saith, *That the Church then admitted not of the Invocation of Saints, but only of the Commemoration of the Martyrs, as appears clearly in S. Augustine, who saith, Although they be at the Sacrifice named in their Order, non tamen à Sacerdote qui sacrificat invocantur: they are not invoked by the Priest who sacrifices.* Now to this you answer, *The Father's meaning is, that the Saints departed are not invoked, or called upon by way of Sacrifice, i. e. as Persons to whom the Sacrifice is offered; which, you say, is a Work of Religion due to God only: and this you prove was all that S. Austin meant, because in other places of his Works, where he teaches, that not only Commemoration is made of the Saints departed in Time of Sacrifice, but that it is done to this particular Intent and Purpose, viz. that they would pray for us; which doubtless amounts to a virtual Invocation of them.* And for this you produce several Passages out of his Works. Two things therefore must be enquired into. 1. What the meaning of *S. Austin* is, when he saith, *That the Saints are not invoked at the Sacrifice.* 2. What his meaning is, in those Places wherein he allows of that you call *Virtual Invocation*, viz. *that the Saints would pray for us.* 1. We are to enquire, What *S. Austin's* meaning is, when he saith, *That the Saints are not invoked at the Sacrifice; meaning no other, (say you) but the Sacrifice of the Mass, which you hope the Reader will mark for S. Austin's sake; wherein you betray most egregious Ignorance or Fraud, if you either suppose the Christians called nothing else a Sacrifice at that time, but what you now call the Mass, or that they did it in the same Respect that you do now.* A *Sacrifice of Prayer and Praise* indeed they had, and a *Commemoration of Christ's Sacrifice* in the *Lord's Supper*, but no such thing as a *propitiatory Sacrifice for the living and the dead*; and I pray mark this for your own sake. But for our better understanding *S. Austin's* meaning, we must consider that he is there comparing the *Honours* which the *Heathens* gave to their *Heroes*, with those which the *Christians* give to the *Martyrs*. They, saith he, *to those Gods of theirs, build Temples, erect Altars, appoint Priests, and offer Sacrifices; but we do not build any Temples to the Martyrs as to Gods, but raise Sepulchres as to dead Men, whose Spirits live with God; neither do we build Altars, at which we may sacrifice to the Martyrs, but we offer up a Sacrifice only to the God of the Martyrs, and of us; at which Sacrifice, saith he, as holy Men of God, who through their Confession of him have overcome the World, they are named in their Place and Order, but are not invoked by the Priest, who offers up the Sacrifice.* Two things may here be understood by the *Sacrifice*, either the anniversary *Sacrifice of Praise to God*, on the Day of their *Natalitia* or *Martyrdoms*; or else the *Celebration of the Eucharist*, which was wont to be done at the *memoriæ Martyrum* chiefly upon that anniversary Day. Now there are many Reasons to incline me to think that *S. Austin* doth not speak of any ordinary celebration of the *Eucharist*, but of that anniversary Solemnity, which was wont to be kept at the *Tombs* of the *Martyrs*

tyrs on the Day of their *Sufferings*. Chiefly because *S. Austin* is here paralleling the *Honours* of the *Martyrs*, with those of the *Heathen Heroes*; and therefore it was reason he should speak of the greatest *Solemnities* which were used for them. Now it is certain that there were such *Anniversary Days* then kept (by many Passages of those times, and somewhat before them) especially in the *African Churches*; and at these they offered up *solemn Prayers and Praises to God*. Both which are clear from this Passage of *S. Cyprian*, *sacrificia pro iis semper ut meministis offerimus, quoties Marti- Cyprian. ep. 34.*
tyrum passiones & dies anniversaria Commemoratione celebramus: Where we find an *anniversary Commemoration* and *sacrifices* offered at them. What these *sacrifices* were, *Rigaltius* in his *Observations* on that Place tells us; *Christiani*, saith he, *sacris anniversariis, laudes Deo dicunt, commemoratis eorum* Rigalt. obs. ad
nominiibus qui pro fide Christo dicta Martyrium fortiter obierunt. So that the *sacrifice* was a *sacrifice of Praise to God* in Behalf of the *Martyrs*. At which they had their *Orationum Sacrificia* too, as *Tertullian* calls them, who saith, *Under the Gospel the pure Sacrifice is Prayer to God: and that the Sinner being* Tertull. c. Mar-
cleansed, ought to offer to God, munus apud Templum, orationem scilicet & gratiarum actionem apud Ecclesiam per Jesum Christum Catholicum Pa- cion. l. 3. p. 497.
tris Sacerdotem, a Sacrifice in his Temple, viz. Prayer and Praise in his Church l. 4. p. 502.
through Jesus Christ the Catholick High Priest of his Father. Hence *S. Cyprian*, *Quando in Sacrificiis precem cum pluribus facimus*, which *Rigaltius* explains P. 512. Ed.
by the publick Prayers, which the Priest made for the People, and understands it Rigalt.
wholly of the Sacrifices of Prayers. So that these solemn Thanksgivings to God Cyprian. ep. 15:
in behalf of the Martyrs, and the Prayers which were made for others, are
those Sacrifices which did belong to these anniversary Solemnities, Oblationes Tertull. de Co-
pro defunctis, pro natalitiis annua die facimus. Those *oblationes pro natalitiis,* ron. Milit.
were nothing else but these solemn Eucharistical Sacrifices in behalf of the c. 3.
Martyrs Sufferings, which were called their Natalitia. Now to apply this
to S. Austin, among the Honours belonging to the Martyrs, he mentions the
Sacrifice which was offered to God in Commemoration of them, and, What
can this be other than on that anniversary Solemnity which Tertullian and
Cyprian mention, that was duly kept on that Account? Now at this Sacri-
fice, saith he, they are named in their Order, but not invocated. Which be-
ing understood of the anniversary Day, and of the Sacrifices of Prayers and
Praises, nothing can be more expreis against Invocation of Saints, than this
place is. For, if ever they were solemnly *invocated*, it certainly would be
on the Day of the great Solemnity for them; and if then all Prayers and
Praises were looked on as due only to God, as Sacrifices belonging to him,
then it cannot but be a robbing God of his Honour, to offer up either Prayers
or Praises to any but himself. But, because it was the Custom at those So-
lemnities, to have the Eucharist administred, and that S. Austin afterwards
mentions this, I shall not exclude the Eucharist here, yet that Sacrifice
may still comprehend all the Supplications which were then used; and if
the Saints were not invocated then, we have reason to conclude they were
not at all. For the *Commemoration* of the *Martyrs* was made after the
Ite, missa est, and the Catechumens were departed; so that there was no
such occasion for their Invocation at any other time, as then. So that
if there were no Invocation of them at the Sacrifice, much less was there
out of it; since all the Solemnities concerning the Martyrs were used in the
time of Celebration. Thus we see, this Place of *S. Austin* is full and clear
against Invocation of Saints, and we must now enquire into what he saith
elsewhere. Only we take notice here, that *S. Austin* not only appropriates
Sacrifices as a thing peculiar to God, but Temples and Altars too. And that Sacri-
fice

fice which was then appropriated to God, was not a propitiatory Sacrifice, but Eucharistical and supplicatory; and by Consequence, if Sacrifice only belongs to God, then all Thanksgiving and Invocation doth too. For both those, we see, were comprehended by the African Fathers under the notion of Sacrifice.

¶ 23.

S. Augustin.
Enchirid. c.
114.
De quantitate
animæ, c. 34.
De verâ Relig.
c. 55.
De Civit. Dei,
l. 10. c. 1.
c. 4.
l. 5. c. 15.
l. 7. c. 32.
Epist. 49.
quæst. 3.
Epist. 63.
Confess. l. 10.
c. 42.

We proceed now to enquire, what S. Austin saith elsewhere; Whether he doth any where else allow Invocation as due to Saints? For which we must consider that S. Austin every where appropriates all Acts of Religion only to God; for he expressly saith, That we must only ask of God that good which we hope to do; that God alone must be served by the Soul, because he alone is the Creator of it: and that every glorified rational Creature, is only to be loved and imitated; that we ought not to apply our Religion to yield Service to the dead; that they must be honoured for Imitation, not worshipped for Religion. That Religion is nothing else but the Worship of God, and therefore we ought not to consecrate our selves to any thing else, by any Religious Rites. That those who have gone to Angels, instead of God, have fallen into many Illusions, and deceitful fancies.

Now is it conceivable, that a Person constant to himself, should so often, and on such good Grounds assert, that all Acts of Religion belong only to God, and yet withal ascribe religious Invocation as due either to Saints or Angels? But we must further consider, that the Ground of S. Austin's distinguishing between *latria* and *dulia*, was not to assert different degrees of religious Worship but to make different kinds of Worship of those two; the one being properly religious Worship, the other only *cultus dilectionis & societatis*, as he calls it, a Worship only of Love and Respect. So that we quarrel not with the Distinction it self, but with your misapplying it. For S. Austin plainly makes the

Colimus ergo Martyres eo cultu dilectionis & societatis, quo & in hac vitâ coluntur Sancti homines Dei. Cont. Faustum, l. 20. c. 21.

honour given to Saints departed, to be of the same nature with that which is given them, while they live: All the difference is, saith he, we may render that Honour to them with the more Confidence, after they have overcome. But

still adds, That all religious Worship is proper only to God. The only Difficulty then is, What is to be understood by those other Passages you produce out of him. And this we have gained already, that they cannot be understood of any religious Worship, without an apparent Contradiction. Your first Citation is, That the Commemoration of Martyrs at the Holy Table, is not that we should pray for them, but rather that they should pray for us. To the same Purpose the second is, That it is an Injury to pray for a Martyr, to whose Prayers we our selves ought to be recommended. The only Things which can be drawn from hence are, that the Martyrs do pray for the Church on Earth, and that we ought to recommend our selves to their Prayers: But what is this to an Invocation of them, when it doth not so much as imply a direct desire of them to pray for us? When this recommending our selves to the Prayers of the Martyrs, is probably understood of nothing else, but a desire that God would hear the Prayers which the Saints in Heaven do make on our Behalf, without any Address to the Martyrs themselves, that they would pray for us. Which seems very unreasonable, without good Assurance that they did hear or understand those Requests of that Nature which are made to them. It is not therefore the saying that the Saints do pray for us, which makes it either lawful or profitable for us to pray to them. For since they ascribe that Honour as alone due to God, so ought we to do too; and I can hardly see how the very praying to Saints to pray for us, being performed with all the Rites of solemn and religious Invocation, can be excused from attributing that Honour to the Creature which is due only to the Creator. And therefore I cannot but wonder at those who would make this only of the same Nature, with our desiring Fellow-Christians to

pray

Tract. 84 in
Johan.
De verbis Ap.
serm. 17. (not.)
34.

pray for us. For is there no difference between a Man's intreating a *Courtier* to present his Petition to the *King*, and his falling down on his *Knees* to him with all the ceremony due to the *King* himself; and then put it off, with saying, that in all that, he only desired him to sue to his *Majesty* in his behalf? Although therefore we condemn not the solemn praying to *God*, not only to hear the prayers of the *Church Militant*, but of that part of it which is *triumphant* in behalf of the other in *General*; yet this falls far short of solemn *addresses* in places of *Divine worship*, and in *Sacred Offices* to the *Saints*, that they would pray for us. This is it, which as to that you call *virtual Invocation*, you should have proved out of *S. Austin*; and yet even that falls much short of that *direct* and *formal Invocation* which is both used and allowed in the *Church of Rome*. But you offer at a further proof of a direct *Ora pro nobis* in *S. Austin*. For (say you) *S. Austin doth profess it to be the General custom of Christians in their recommending themselves to the Saints, to say, Memor esto nostri; which surely no man will contend to signify less than ora pro nobis.* I grant, it signifies as much where *S. Austin* uses it; but if you had consulted the place, you might easily have seen how wholly impertinent it is to your purpose. For *S. Austin* speaks not at all there of *Saints* departed, but of them *living*; and that it was a common thing among *Christians* to say to any of them *Memor esto mei*, Remember me in your prayers; which appears by the whole scope of that *Chapter*, where he speaks of giving *alms*, and the effect of them on those who received them in making them mindful of them. It cannot be denied, but some of them did use such expressions to those who were near their *Martyrdom*; but still this only shews the requesting it of them, when they were sure they heard them; but it proves not any solemn *Invocations* of them when they were dead. But if we should grant, that there are expressions intimating a desire that *Saints* in *Heaven* should pray for them, which is the utmost you can make of the citation out of the *Sermon* on *S. Stephen* (which with the rest *de Sanctis* is vehemently suspected, and the other on *Job* is counterfeit) yet there is a great deal of difference to be put between such a calling upon *Martyrs* (of whom only *S. Austin* speaks) out of a desire of their Prayers; and a solemn and direct praying to them in the most *Sacred offices* and *publick devotions*, which is used and approved in your *Church*. For whatever there might be of *private devotion* (not to call it *superstition*) this way in *S. Austin's* time, in desiring the prayers of departed *Saints* whom they could have no ground at all to believe they heard them; yet you can bring no evidence of any use of this in the *publick offices* of the *Church*, much less of that direct *Invocation*, which we most of all charge your *Church* with. That then which began in meer *hypothetical addresses*, went somewhat further, when they began to grow more confident that in some extraordinary way or other the *Saints* heard them; but still this kept it self within the bounds of the *cultus dilectionis & societatis*, that respect which arose from *Love and Communion*; but it was a good while after before it obtained a place in the *publick Offices*, and yet longer, before it came to that height of *Religious Invocation*, which is more practised than pleaded for in the *Church of Rome*. For although great endeavours be used to smooth over these gross abuses with fair distinctions, of *relative and absolute, direct and indirect worship*; yet the general practice is incapable of being palliated by these narrow coverings, there being the most *formal* and *direct Invocations* used to *Saints* for spiritual and temporal blessings. Which being allowed of in common practice and the most *sacred Offices*, can never be excused from as great *Idolatry* as the *Heathens* were guilty of, in the worship of their *Inferiour Deities*.

Spalat. ofcen.
err
Suarez c. 2.
sect. 20.
Wicel. via. re-
gia de invocat.
Sanct.

§. 24.
Pag. 276.

P. 292.

De Sanct. bea-
titud. l. 1. c. 19.

I conclude this therefore with that of *Spalatenfis*, Religious Invocation of Saints is Heathenism; and meer civil Invocation of them, though not so bad, is yet dangerous. And therefore *Wicelius* justly saith, That the Invocation of Saints, is to be cast out of the Church, because it ascribes God's honour and attributes to his creatures, and derogates from the Office and Glory of Christ by making Saints, Mediators and Intercessors.

Which is that we now come to consider. For, as his Lordship saith, When the Church prayed to God for anything, she desired to be heard for the mercies and the merits of Christ, and not for the merits of any Saints whatsoever. For I much doubt, this were to make the Saints more than Mediators of Intercession, which is all that you will acknowledge you allow to the Saints. For, I pray, is not by the merits more than by the Intercession? Did not Christ redeem us by his merits? And if God must hear our prayers for the merits of the Saints, how much fall they short of sharers in the mediation of Redemption? Such prayers as these the Church of Rome makes at this day, and they stand (not without great scandal to Christ and Christianity) used and authorized to be used in the Missal. To this you Answer in two things. 1. That such Prayers as these, are used in Scripture. 2. That they are no derogation to the Merits of Christ. For the first, you say, Solomon, Psal. 132. prays to God to hear him, in effect for the merits of his Father David deceased, when he saith, Memento, Domine, David & omnis mansuetudinis ejus, Lord remember David and all his meekness, &c. This (you say) cannot be understood of God's Covenant and Promise made to David (as Protestants vainly pretend) but of David's Piety and Virtue by which he was acceptable to God. For which reason he adds again, For thy servant David's sake turn not away the face of thine Anointed. The like was done by Daniel, Moses, Hieremias and other Prophets praying unto God, and desiring their petitions might be heard for Abraham, for Isaac, for Israel's sake, and for the sake of other holy Men, who had lived before, and been in their times persons acceptable to God. And for this you quote St. Austin and Chrysostome. So far you have very fairly rendred Bellarmin exactly in English. But we are yet to seek, Why all those expressions in Scripture are not to be understood of the Covenant and Promise God made with those Persons who are mentioned by you. For it is considerable, that you instance in none but such whom God had made an express Covenant with, as with the Patriarchs, and with David. But since you say, That this Answer hath not the least ground from the Text, therein you out-do Bellarmin, and speak that which the Text evidently contradicts you in. For Psal. 132, 11. next after those very words, For thy servant David's sake; it follows, The Lord hath sworn in truth unto David; and, in the following verse, the Covenant God made with David is mentioned. If thy Children will keep my Covenant and my Testimony that I shall teach them, their Children also shall sit upon thy throne for evermore. You had then much consulted the Text when you say, This exposition had not the least ground from it; for that speaks expressly of the Promise and Covenant which God made with David. And what you add to the text, of David's Piety and Virtue, we may more justly say, hath not the least ground from it. For the word doth not signifie meekness but affliction, and therefore *Aquila* renders it *καταχίαις*, *Symmachus* *κατάσας*, and some old Copies *ταπεινώσεις*, all referring not to David's merits, but to his sufferings. And it is not improbably conceived by some, that this Psalm is not of Solomon's penning, but of David's; and that at the time when the Ark was to be brought back from the House of Obed Edom to Hierusalem. And in all those other places of Scripture mention'd, referring to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob; the Scripture is very plain, that they are to be understood of the

Covenant

Covenant God made with them: As appears by the very words of *Moses*, Remember Abraham, Isaac, and Israel thy servants, to whom thou swarest by thine own self, &c. And God himself speaks often of his remembering his Covenant which he made with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; and that is the ground why the Prophets afterwards plead the remembrance of those Persons, because the Covenant made with them was the foundation of all those Blessings which the Children of Israel expected afterwards. The utmost that can be made of St. *Augustin's* Testimony is, That God may sometimes shew favour to a People that hath deserved ill at his hands for the sake of such as pray for them; as he did to the people of Israel for the sake of *Moses*. And all that St. *Chrysostom* saith, is, That God may shew mercy to wicked Men for the sake of their righteous Ancestors who are dead. But this is no more than he hath promised, That he will shew mercy to them that love him to the third and fourth Generation. But there is a great deal of difference to be made between the expressions of God's bounty and the Foundation of our prayers; which ought to be only a promise of God. And in this Case we deny it not to be lawful, to pray that God would remember his Promise: but that is a quite different thing from praying that we may receive Blessings through the merits of the Saints in Heaven. So that it cannot be hence concluded, that 'tis no unwarrantable thing to pray that God would hear us for the merits of the Saints.

Exod. 32. 13.
Exod. 6. 5, 8.
Levit. 26. 42.
45.

Aug. in Exod.
quest. 49.

Chrysost. hom.
42. in Gen.
hom. 27. in
Matth.

But this will be further explained now we come to see, how you vindicate this from being any derogation to the merits of *Christ*. We believe, say you, and confess that *Christ* alone is our Redeemer; and that he, and none but he, by the just price of his most precious blood, hath paid our ransom, and fully satisfied the justice of God for our sins: all that we desire of the Saints, either when we mention their merits to God, or simply beg their Intercession with God for us, is only, that they would join with us in prayer to God, and that God would be pleased for their sakes, whose works were so grateful to him, to bestow on us the favours we ask. When things are so odious in the practice of them, that they cause all Persons of any Ingenuity among yourselves to cry out upon them, then your Arts are, To let the same practices continue still, but to find out some plausible pretext to colour them over with. As it is here in the business of praying to Saints, and making them thereby to be Mediators between God and us; which implying so great dishonour to the All-sufficiency of the Merits and Intercession of *Christ*, you are fain to find out the fairest excuses you can make for it, although the practices still continue which overthrow all the distinctions you use. Thus it is plain, that direct and formal prayers in your Church are made to Saints; but, you say, these are only to intreat them to pray for us: You pray expressly (as his Lordship tells you) That God by the merits and prayers of Saints would deliver you from the fire of Hell; that you may obtain the glory of Eternity by their merits; and that God would absolve you from your sins by their interceding merits: And yet for all this, you would have us believe, that you offer no derogation at all to the Merits and Intercession of *Christ*. But is it not the great honour of *Christ* that his Merits and Intercession alone are all-sufficient to procure all spiritual blessings for us? And can any spiritual blessings be greater then deliverance from Hell; eternal Glory, and the forgiveness of Sins? And when you pray for all these through the Merits of the Saints, how can you possibly more disparage the all-sufficiency of the Merits of *Christ*? For, if those be sufficient what need any more? Will God grant that for the Merits of the Saints, which he would not do for the Intercession of *Christ*? Or, do we want the Merits of the Saints to apply the Merits of *Christ*? but still something

§. 25.

P. 293.

P. 277.

Concil. Trident.
Sess. ult.

Catech. Rom.
P. 3. P. 504.

Ibid.

1 Cor. 9. 23.

of weakness and defect must be implied in them, if some further additional *Merits* be wanting for the application of the former. If a *Prince* should declare to some of his *Father's* Subjects, that he would satisfy his *Father's* displeasure, and intercede for them that they should have an absolute pardon; Would it not argue a distrust of the *Prince's* Interest to solicit some *Inferiour Attendants* to intreat the *King* to pardon them for their *sakes*? And it is here a plain case, whatever you pretend, that you do not only pray that the *Saints* would joyn in prayer to God with you, but you run to them for *help and assistance*, in order to the obtaining the greatest spiritual blessings from God. For so the *Council of Trent* expressly defines, *That it is not only good and profitable to Invoke the Saints, but ob beneficia impetranda a Deo per Christum ad eorum orationes, opem auxiliumque confugere*; for the obtaining of blessings from God through Christ, we ought to fly to their prayers, *help and assistance*. If nothing else were meant, but only that the *Saints* should pray for us, What means *help and assistance* mentioned as distinct from their prayers? And the *Roman Catechism* more fully delivers it (which was published by order of the *Council of Trent*) viz. *That Saints are not only to be Invoked, because of their prayers to God, but because God bestows many blessings on us, eorum merito & gratia, by their merits and favour*; and after adds, *Rogati & peccatorum veniam impetrabunt, & conciliabunt nobis dei gratiam*; Being asked, they will obtain the pardon of sin, and procure for us the favour of God. And, What can be more said concerning Christ himself? Although therefore you say never so much, *That your prayers are made to the Saints through the merits of Christ*, and that you conclude all your prayers, *per Christum Dominum nostrum*; yet all this cannot clear you from suffering the greatest dishonour to the *merits* and *intercession* of Christ, since it is plain you rely on the *Saints merits*, in order to the obtaining the Blessings you pray for. But, say you, *If the Saints being rewarded in Heaven for their merits, be not injurious to the fulness of Christs merits, Why should their being heard by vertue of those merits, when they pray to God for us through Christ, or our desire that they may be heard for them, be thought injurious to Christs merits*? To which I answer, those *merits* which you suppose in *Saints*, when they are rewarded in Heaven, have either an equal proportion with the reward they receive, or not? If not, then they cease to be merits, and the giving the reward, (though an act of Justice, the Promise supposed) yet in itself is holy an act of Grace and Favour; if they have, then the full recompence is received by that reward, and nothing further can be obtained for others on their account. But in the sense it is to be suspected you take *merits* in, we as well assert, that the proportioning the reward in Heaven to the *merits* of *Saints*, is injurious to the *fulness* of *Christs merits*, as their obtaining mercies for others by reason of them. Only this latter adds to the dishonour, in that there is not only supposed a proportion between Heaven and them; but, as though that were not enough, a further efficacy is attributed to them, for obtaining mercies for others too. His Lordship therefore does not go about to pervert the sense of the prayers used in your Missal; but the plain words and sense of them evidently shew, how contrary they are to Christian Doctrine and Piety. Bellarmin's saying, that the *Saints* may in some sense be called our Redeemers, cannot be vindicated by that saying of S. Paul, *That he became all Things to all men, that he might save some*; because salvation respects the effect of Christ's death, the promotion of which may in some sense be attributed to the Instruments of it, such as S. Paul was here on Earth; but Redemption respects the *merits* by which that effect was obtained, and so belongs wholly

wholly to *Christ*, and cannot be attributed to any *Saints*, either in Earth or Heaven. When you can prove that any subordinate *Instruments* of God's Power are called *Numina*, you may then excuse *Bellarmin* for calling the *Saints* so; but that is so incongruous a sense of the word, that it needs no confutation.

We are now come to the *last Error*, which his Lordship here charges your pretended *General Councils* with, which is, concerning *Adoration of Images*. Of which, his Lordship says, *That the Ancient Church knew it not, And the Modern Church of Rome is too like to Paganism, in the practice of it; and driven to scarce intelligible subtilties in her servants writings that defend it. And this, without any care had of millions of souls, unable to understand her subtilties, or shun her practice.* Here you say, *The Bishop is very bitter;* but no more then the nature of the thing required. All the Answer you return to this, lyes in these things. 1. *That the Church of Rome teaches nothing concerning the Worship of Images, but what the second Council of Nice did nine hundred years ago; which is, that they must be had in Veneration, and due Reverence, but not have Divine Worship given to them.* 2. *That Images were in common Use and Veneration too, among Christians in the Ancient Church.* 3. *That what abuses are crept in, are not to be imputed to the Church, but to particular persons.* This is the substance of what you say to the end of the Chapter; as to which a brief Answer will suffice, because I design not a full handling the Question of the worship of Images. If that which you say in the first place, be true, it doth the more prove that which his Lordship intends, viz. that not one barely, but two of those you own to be *General Councils*, have erred in this particular. If either those *Councils*, or you, had intended to have dealt fairly and honestly with the World, they and you should have declared, what that *Veneration* and *Reverence* is, which is due to Images; What difference you put between that, and the *Worship* due to God; and, Whether the same pretences and excuses would not as well have justified the *Pagan Idolatries*? For this was it which his Lordship charged you with, that you came too near *Paganism* in your practice. But as to this you Answer nothing, but that if you do, so did the Council of *Nice* too: But, Is that a sufficient excuse for you? It is well enough known, What kind of Council that was; How much it was opposed by the Synod of *Frankford*, How many persons both in the *Eastern* and *Western Churches*, declared themselves against the *Doctrine* of it? But, What a pitiful plea is it for you to say, *That the Council of Trent had silenced all calumnies, by saying, That you attribute no Divinity to the Images, but only worship them with such honour and reverence as is due to them?* Would not any considerate *Heathens* have said as much as this is? But, the Question is, Whether that *Veneration* of them which is used by you towards Images, be due to them, or no? This you should have undertaken, and set the distinct limits between the worship due to God, and that which is given to these. You should have proved, that this is no prohibited way of worship; for, if it be, it can in no sense be due to them. For, since God may determine the modes of his own worship, what he hath forbidden in his service becomes unlawful; and, so long as that command continues in force, all acts of worship contrary to it, are a positive kind of Idolatry. For, as there is a kind of *Natural Idolatry* lying in the worship of false Gods instead of the true; so there is that which may be called *Positive Idolatry*, which is a worshipping God in a way or manner which he hath forbidden. From whence the *Israelites* in the *Golden Calf*, and the *Ten Tribes* in the worship of the *Calves* at *Dan* and *Bethel*, are charged with Idolatry, although they acknowledged the

§. 26.

P. 277.

P. 294.

the true God, and designed that for a *Relative worship* to him. If it were so then, you should have shewed us, How it comes to be otherwise now. Where it was, God repealed the second *Commandment*? or, What there was in it typical and ceremonial, that it must cease to oblige at *Christ's coming*? or, What *Reasons* it was built on, which were only proper to the *Jews*, and cannot extend to the *Christians* too? and, Why *Relative Worship*, and the helps for *memory* and *devotion* would not as well have justified the use and worship of *Images*, before *Christ* as after? And why the same reasons from the danger of *Idolatry*; low conceptions of *God* (and what other reasons you will give of that prohibition then) may not hold as well still? These, and many other things, if you would have vindicated the practice of your *Church*, you ought to have insisted. But since you omit them wholly, and think to put us off with repeating the *Decree* of the *Council of Trent*, you only shew the weakness of your *Cause*, and of those unintelligible subtilties which are used to defend it.

§. 27.
Optat. l. 3.

To what his Lordship saith, That, in Optatus his time, the *Christians* were much troubled upon but a false report, that an *Image* was to be placed upon the *Altar*; What would they have done, if *Adoration* had been commanded? You answer, That it was either some *Idol*, or common *Image* of a *Man*, or of the *Emperor*, or the *Governor* of the *Province*, or something or other, but you cannot tell what. But if it had been any of all these, how easie had it been for them to have vindicated themselves by saying, That if it had been the *Image* of *Christ*, or some *Saint*, they would then have worshipped it, but they could not otherwise? But we see, it was not because it was such or such an *Image*, that the displeasure was taken, but that it was any at all; and this was then justly looked on as a strange thing, being so contrary to the practice of the *Christian Church*, from *Christ's* time till that. This you deny, and say, That the *Images* of *Christ* and the *Saints* were in common use and veneration too, amongst *Christians* in the *Ancient Church*. How is it possible to deal with you, that dare with so much confidence obtrude such notorious falsities upon the world? There being scarce any thing imaginable, in which there are more expresse Testimonies for so many Ages together than against the use or veneration of *Images* in the *Ancient Church*. With what scorn and contempt do the *Primitive Christians* reject the use of *Images*, and that not in regard of an *absolute*, but a *relative Worship*? If you had read the discourses of the *Christians* in the *Primitive times*, such as *Clemens Alexandrinus*, *Origen* against *Celsus*, *Tertullian*, *Minutius Felix*, *Arnobius*, *Lactantius*, *Athanasius*, *Eusebius*, *S. Augustin* where they dispute against the *Heathens*, not meerly for worshipping *Idols*, but for any worship of *Images*, though meerly as they are *signs* or *symbols* of the proper objects of worship, you could not possibly have uttered so gross a falshood as that foregoing, unless you were resolved to offer violence to your Conscience in it. If you think the *Council of Trent* brings off all this by saying, *Men must not believe there is any Divinity in Images*, and that it was the worship which arose from such an apprehension which the *Fathers* disputed against; I assure you, you are greatly deceived. For there is no such difference between the *Heathens* apprehensions, and yours, as to the worship of *Images* as you imagine. Who is such a fool, saith *Celsus*, to think that these are *Gods*, and not the bare *Images* of them? You are greatly mistaken (saith the *Heathen* in *Arnobius*) if you think that we worship the *Images* for gods; no, we worship the gods by and through them; and therefore saith, That the *Ancients* were not ignorant that the *Images* had neither sense nor divinity in them, but only that the rude and ignorant *People* wanted such things to put them in mind of the gods.

Orig. c. Cels.
l. 7.
Arnob. l. 6.

gods. What is there more than this, that you have to plead for the Use of them? *Non ipsa timemus simulachra* (say the Heathens in *Lactantius*) *sed eos ad quorum imaginem facta, & quorum nominibus consecrata sunt*; We worship not the Images, but them to whom they are consecrated; which in your language is, They give them not an absolute, but a relative Worship. *Nec simulachrum nec Dæmonium colo, sed per effigiem corporalem ejus rei signum intueor, quam solere debeo*, saith the Heathen in *S. Augustin*; I neither worship the Image, nor the Damon in it, but only by that visible representation, I am put in mind of that which I ought to worship. If you say, This was not the common sense of them, but only some more subtile Men asserted this, because they could not defend their gross Idolatries otherwise, the very same is most true of yourselves; your distinctions are such which the People are not capable of in the worship they give; and they only serve to answer those who dislike so palpable an imitation of *Heathenism*, as is in the worship of Images. And it will be hard to find that any Heathens had any higher thoughts of their Images, or used greater acts of Worship towards them, than the People of your Church do. For, Are not miraculous operations among you ascribed to Images of Saints? And what greater Testimony of Divinity can be supposed in them? Do not they fall down in the most devout manner to them, and make the most formal addresses before them? and that not merely with a respect to what is represented, but with a worship belonging to the Images themselves? And, What more than this did ever the Heathens do? So that those Fathers who so much condemned that use and veneration of Images which was among the Heathens, must needs be understood to condemn as much that in your Church too. And thence *Eusebius* ascribes the setting up the Statue at *Paneas* to a Heathen custom; thence *Epiphanius* rent the vail at *Anablatha*, wherein the Image of Christ, or some Saint, was drawn; thence the Council of *Elvira* in Spain, forbids the placing of pictures in Churches, lest that which is worshipped or adored, should be painted on Walls; thence *S. Augustin* condemns the worshippers of Pictures; thence the very Art of Painting was condemned in the Ancient Church, as appears by *Clemens Alexandrius*, and *Tertullian*; and after all this, Is it possible to believe what you say, viz. That Images were in common use and veneration too in the Ancient Church? But surely we shall have some evident proof for so bold an assertion: It were well if there were any thing looked like it. For all that you produce, is only, That in *Tertullian's* time, the Christians were abused with the nick-name of *Crucis Religiosi*; and that in *Chrysostom's* time, the Cross made a glorious shew upon the Altar. And, Are not these invincible proofs for the veneration of Images in the Ancient Church? But, why do you not as well say, The Christians worshipped an Ass's Head, the Sun, and *Ononychites*; for all these are in the same Chapter, and equally reckon'd among the false Accusations of the Christians. But it seems you had rather believe the Heathens objection, than the Christians denial, whose Answer we find expresse to the contrary in *Minutius Felix*, *Cruces nec colimus, nec optamus*, we neither wish for, nor worship Crosses; and *Tertullian*, in answer to the former cavil saith, *Quod colimus nos, Deus unus est*; That which we worship is only God. They were then strangers to any such distinctions of worship as you have invented to answer such places with, viz. that they did not worship them absolutely, but relatively. And for all that I can perceive, by the same distinctions you may prove that the Christians did worship Demons and Heroes; for, although they deny it never so much, I may as well say, they meant only by it, that they did not worship them with the Worship proper only to God, but with

Euseb. hist. l. 7.

c. 18.

Epiph. ep. ad

Joh. Hieros.

Council. Eliber.

can. 36.

Aug. de mor.

rib. Eccles.

Catch. c. 34.

Clem. Alex.

Protrept.

Tertull. ad

Hermog. init.

P. 296.

Tertull. Apolog.

c. 16.

Minut. Fel.

P. 33.

Bellarmin. de
Imag. Sanct. l.
2. c. 28.

with an inferior and relative Worship, as you say as much concerning Images; by which art you may evade all denials whatsoever. For your place of S. Chrysostom, the most that Bellarmin makes of it, is, That in his time the Cross was wont to be painted in all places, in Cities, Houses, Chambers, Vessels, not a word in him of Altars, which he would not have left out, had he found any such thing in him, but you intended to take care we should not search too far, by not referring us to the Edition of S. Chrysostom, which you, or your Author made use of. But, What is all this to the veneration of the Cross, if we grant that it did make a glorious shew on the Altar? Could it not make a glorious shew, unless they all fell down and worshipped it? And, Can you think now, that these testimonies are sufficient against the whole strain of Antiquity, to persuade Men that the veneration of Images was used in the Ancient Church? But you are Men who can believe what you have a mind to; any word, clause, or impertinent allegation, that doth but seem afar off, to cast an eye towards you, is presently the consent of all Antiquity, when the most pregnant testimonies of the best Writers of the Church against you, are pil'd at, and scorned, or else eluded with most frivolous interpretations, or lastly suspected without any shadow of reason. As the Epistle of Epiphanius, and the Canon of the Eliberim Council have been in this present Controversie. When you shall produce your other testimonies, an answer shall attend them; but you must not think the story of the Statue at Paneas, which Eusebius attributes to a Heathenish Custom (besides the many improbabilities in it) will ever persuade us, that the Christians did then worship Images. But it would now take up too much time to examine that particularly, with others of a like nature. What I have said already, being sufficient to give an account of the Sense of the Primitive Church, as to this Subject, which is our present business.

§. 28.

P. 298.

We pass by the resemblance between the Feasts at the Oratories of Martyrs, and the Heathen Parentalia, because you say now it seems wholly extirpated. And I would not charge you with more faults than you are guilty of, since you have enough without it. An evidence of which, is your discarding all Persons from your Communion, who are not such Bigots, as to approve all the abuses and corruptions among you; Which sufficiently appears by your censure of Cassander; Who (you say) seemed to many to halt between God and Baal; and, although he was not actually excommunicate, yet you would have us believe he was meritoriously so, because he favoured Heresie so much. By which we see, that we must not judge all of the Roman Communion, who profess themselves to be of it; for so Cassander did to his death. But, whoever offer to find the least fault with the Practices or Doctrine of your Church, let them pretend never so much to be of it, yet they may be excommunicate, *sententia juris*; and so not only Cassander but Erasmus, Espenceus, Fernus, Barnes, Picherellus, and all other persons of reason and ingenuity among you, ought not to be looked on as persons of your Communion, whatever their pretences be. It seems your Church bears none but Hectors, and in a short time none shall be accounted Papists, but Jesuits: but it is hard to determine, Whether this discovers more the corruption, or tyranny of your Church; which loves her degeneracy so much, that she proscribes all who dare in the least to tell her of her faults. But, How can she be found fault with, that take such excellent care to prevent all abuses, as appears by the caution of the Council of Trent, in the present Case of your worship of Images? For, say you, As to any matter of abuse in this kind, crept in amongst the ignorant, we have already shewn, how careful the Council of Trent

P. 297.

Trent was to prevent and provide against all inconveniencies that could reasonably be foreseen or feared. So it seems, by the admirable Caution used by the Council to prevent giving undue Worship to Images, by telling Men, They must only give that which was due; when all the Question was, What was due? and, What not? So it seems, by the care used to instruct the People concerning the Nature of Divine Worship, and the Danger of Idolatry. So it seems, by the leaving out the second Commandment in the offices of frequent use, least the Peoples Consciences should check them, for doing that which God had severely prohibited. So it seems, by the unintelligible subtilties concerning the nature of that Worship which is to be given to the Image; when yet a mistake there, makes the Person who gives it, guilty of Idolatry. So it seems, by the continuance of the most gross abuses in this nature still in your Church, in this matter of Images. Of which such things are related by Eye-witnesses, that the most gross Heathen Idolatries were not more unreasonable, absurd, and ridiculous, than they are. And if People continue ignorant, and sottish enough, all is well; but if with Cassander, they charge you with any Corruptions, then they stand meritoriously excommunicate: and it is well if they escape so; for, although Cassander did, Father Barnes did not. But, plead as long as you will for the care your Church hath taken to prevent all Abuses in the worship of Images; as long as the Worship of Images continues, it is impossible to prevent the abuses in it: since that is a great abuse itself, and gives occasion to all others. For, the Vindication of your Doctrine depends on such Mataphysical Niceties, which the Minds of People are incapable of; and, however they may serve you in disputation, are impossible to be reconciled with the practice of your Church, and the Apprehensions of those who yield the worship you allow to Images. And therefore it is no wonder at all what Llamas relates of the Spanish People, that they were so besotted on their old worm-eaten Images, that when they were to have new ones in their rooms, they begg'd with tears to have their old ones still. But, although you grant these People guilty of Indiscretion, yet by no means of Idolatry, because they did not call them their gods. If you think none were Idolaters, but such as did believe their Images to be Gods; I doubt you may find the number of Atheists as great as that of Idolaters in the World. But if we may guess at Peoples apprehensions by their Actions, these seemed as much to believe them to be Gods, as any Heathens you can instance in. Your vindication of Llamas from saying, That the Images of Christ, and the Saints, as they represent their exemplars, have Deity or Divinity in them; as it is undertaken somewhat fearfully, because (you say) you hope to clear his meaning, whatever his words seem to import; so at last it stands on the sandy Foundation of relative and absolute Worship, which being taken away, that and your Images fall together. I conclude this Subject with his Lordship's wish; That men of Learning would not strain their Wits to spoil the Truth, and rent the Peace of the Church of Christ, by such dangerous, such superstitious Vanities. For better they are not, but they may be worse: And I fear are so.

P. 298.

P. 299.

P. 279.

m.

C H A P. IV.

84:2B.

Of the possibility of Salvation in the Roman Church.

Protestants Concessions ought not to be any ground to prefer the Communion of the Church of Rome. How far those Concessions extend. The uncharitableness of Romanists, if they yield not the same to us. The weakness of the Arguments to prove the Roman Church the safer way to Salvation on Protestant Principles. The dangerous Doctrines of Romanists about the easiness of Salvation, by the Sacrament of Penance. The Case parallel'd between the Donatists and Romanists, in denying Salvation to all but themselves; and the advantages equal from their Adversaries Concessions. The advantage of the Protestants, if that be the safest way which both Parties are agreed in, manifested and vindicated in several particulars. The Principle itself at large shewed to be a meer contingent Proposition, and such as may lead to Heresie and Infidelity. The Case of the Leaders in the Roman Church, and others, distinguished. The Errors and Superstitions of the Roman Church, make its communion very dangerous in order to Salvation.

§. I.

THe main thing which now remains to be discussed, is, Whether the Communion of your Church, or ours, be rather to be chosen, in order to Salvation. For that being the great End of our Faith, the tendency to the promotion of that, ought to be the Rule, by which we should embrace or continue in the Society of any Church. And, since the regard Men ought to have of their Eternal welfare, doth oblige them to make choice of the best means in order to it, the bare remote Possibility of Salvation in any Church, ought to have no force or consideration at all in the determining their choice in a matter of so great Importance. As, supposing a Pilot at Sea, whose only desire is to bring his Ship safe into his desired Port, should be told, That there are two Passages homewards; the one free and open, in which there is no danger; the other amidst many Rocks and Shelves, in which yet there is a Possibility of escaping: Would not he be accounted a very weak Man, that should chuse this latter way, meerly because it is possible he may escape; and neglect the other, in which there is no danger of miscarrying? So it is here in our present Case, the Protestants confess there is a possibility for some to escape in the Communion of the Roman Church; but it is as Men may escape with their lives in a shipwreck; but they undertake to make it evident, there can be no danger, if they observe the Principles of Protestant Religion: Would it not be madness in any then to neglect this, and make choice of the other, meerly because Protestants agree with you, that there is a possibility of Salvation for some in the Roman Church? Yet this is the great Argument you make use of, whereby to Proselyte such Persons, who want Judgment enough to discern the weakness and sophistry of it. That therefore we are now to enquire into, is, Whether your Communion, or ours, be more eligible upon Principles of Reason and Prudence, in order to Salvation? And two things are insisted on in behalf of your Church; first, That Protestants grant the possibility of Salvation in your Church, but you deny it in ours, and therefore yours is the safer way. Secondly, That the Faith of Protestants doth not stand upon those sure grounds which your Faith doth.

As

As to the first, there are two Things to be considered. 1. How far we grant a possibility of Salvation to those in your Church. 2. What can be inferr'd from that Concession in the choice of Religion. The occasion of entring upon this Debate was the Lady's Query, Whether she might be saved in the Roman Faith; to which his Lordship answers in General, that the Ignorant that could not discern the Errors of that Church, so they held the Foundation and conformed themselves to a religious Life, might be saved; and more particularly to the Lady, that it must needs go harder with her, even in Point of Salvation, because she had been brought to understand very much for one of her condition, in these Controverted Causes of Religion. And a Person that comes to know much, had need carefully bethink himself, that he oppose not known Truth against the Church that made him a Christian; for Salvation may be in the Church of Rome, and they not find it that make surest of it. And after, he explains himself more fully, That might be saved, grants but a possibility; no sure or safe way to Salvation; the possibility, I think, saith he, cannot be denyed to the Ignorants, especially because they hold the Foundation, and cannot survey the Building. And the Foundation can deceive no Man that rests upon it. But a secure way they cannot go, that hold with such Corruptions when they know them. Now, whether it be Wisdom, in such a Point as Salvation is, to forsake a Church in which the ground of Salvation is firm, to follow a Church in which it is but possible one may be saved, but very probable he may do worse, if he look not well to the Foundation; judge ye. So that still his Lordship asserts the Protestants way to be the only safe way to Salvation; and that in the Church of Rome there is only a limited possibility of it, which is such, that he says, A. C. or his Fellows can take little comfort in. For as he after declares himself, Many Protestants indeed confess, there is Salvation possible to be attained in the Roman Church; but yet they say, withal, that the Errors of that Church are so many, (and some so great, as weaken the Foundation) that it is very hard to go that way to Heaven, especially to them that have had the Truth manifested; and a little after, But we have not so learned Christ, as either to return evil for evil in this heady course, or to deny Salvation to some ignorant silly Souls, whose humble peaceable obedience makes them safe among any part of Men that profess the Foundation Christ. And in another place, I do indeed for my part (leaving other Men free to their own Judgment) acknowledge a possibility of Salvation in the Roman Church. But so, as that which I grant to Romanists, is not as they are Romanists, but as they are Christians, that is, as they believe the Creed, and hold the Foundation Christ himself, not as they associate themselves wittingly and knowingly to the gross Superstitions of the Roman Church. And I am willing to hope there are many among them, which keep within that Church, and yet wish the Superstitions abolished which they know, and which pray to God to forgive their Errors in what they know not, and which hold the Foundation firm, and live accordingly, and which would have all things amended that are amiss, were it in their power. And to such I dare not deny a possibility of Salvation, for that which is Christ's in them, though they hazard themselves extreamly by keeping so close to that which is Superstition, and in the Case of Images comes too near Idolatry. The substance then of what his Lordship saith, is, That the Protestant way is a safe and secure way to Salvation; that in the Roman Church there is extream hazard made of it, which all who love their Souls ought to avoid; but yet for such, who by reason of ignorance see not the danger, and by reason of honesty keep close to Christ the Foundation, and repent of all miscarriages known or unknown, he dares not deny a possibility of Salvation for them. But he is far from asserting it of those, who either know the Corruptions of that Church and yet continue in them, or such who wilfully

P. 280.

P. 281.

P. 285.

P. 299.

P. 301.

wilfully neglect the means whereby they may be convinced of them. So that you strangely either mistake or pervert his Lordship's meaning when you would infer from these Passages, *That he asserts a possibility of being saved to those who joyn with the Roman Church, though their Ignorance be not invincible, and though all or the chief motives which the Protestants bring against you be never so sufficiently proposed to them.* For he still speaks either of such, whose meer ignorance doth excuse them where the *Fundamentals* are held, and a Life led according to them, or else of such who condemn your *Superstitions* as far as they are discovered to them, and sincerely desire to find impartially the way that leads to Heaven; Of such as these he dares not deny a *possibility of Salvation*.

§. 3.

And you are the most uncharitable Persons in the World, if you dare assert the contrary of *Protestants*. You expressly grant a *possibility of Salvation* to those who joyn with the Protestant Church, in Case of *invincible ignorance*; and dare you deny it where there is a Preparation of Mind to find out and embrace the most certain way to Heaven, where all endeavours are used to that end, and where there is a conscientious Obedience to the *Will of God*, so far as it is discovered? If you dare Peremptorily deny a *possibility of Salvation* to such Persons, meerly because not of the *Roman Church*, this prodigious uncharitableness would make us question the *possibility* of your *Salvation* more, while you persist in it. For, what is there more contrary to the *design* and *Spirit* of the *Gospel* than this is? From whence must we gather the terms of *Salvation*, but only from thence? But it seems by you, although Men give never so hearty an assent to the *Doctrine* of the *Gospel*, and live in the most universal obedience to it, and abound in the *Fruits* of the *Spirit* of *God*, of which *Charity* is none of the least; yet if they be not in the *Communion* of your *Church*, there is no hopes of *Salvation*, for them. But, Who is it the mean while that hath the disposal of this *Salvation*? Is it in your *hands* or *Christ's*? If it be in His, we dare rely on His *Promise*, although you pretend to know His mind better than He did himself. For, notwithstanding a sincere endeavour to know and obey the *Will of God*, be the great *Fundamental* in order to *Salvation*, which is delivered us by the *Doctrine* of *Christ*; yet it seems by you, there may be this, where there may be not so much as *possibility of Salvation*. By which assertion of yours, you are so far from working upon any, but very weak Persons, to bring them over to your *Church*, that nothing can more effectually prejudice it among all such who dare believe *Christ* to be more *Infallible* than the *Church* of *Rome*. For what is this else, but to make Heaven and Eternal *Salvation* stalk to the *interest* of your *Church*, and to lay more weight upon being in your communion, than upon the most indispensable *Precepts* of *Christianity*? But when we consider how many among you dispute for the possibility of the *Salvation* of *Heathens*, and yet deny it to those who own all the *Fundamentals* of *Christianity*; when we see how much you lay the weight of *Salvation* upon being in your *Church*, and what ways you have for those who are in it to reconcile the *hopes* of *Salvation* with the *Practice* of *Sin*, What can we otherwise imagine, but it is the *Interest* of your *Church* that you more Aim at, than the *Salvation* of *Men's Souls*? For you have so many ways to give *indulgence* in *Sin* to those who desire it, and yet such ready ways of *Pardon*, and such an easie task of *Repentance*, and so little troublesome means of obtaining *grace* by the *Sacraments*, *ex opere operato*, that it is hard conceiving what way a Man should sooner take, who would live in his *Sins* and come to Heaven at last, than to be of your *Church*. And yet

yet you who are so *soft and gentle*, so *kind and indulgent* to the *Sons* of your Church, are not more ready to send those who are out of it to the *fire* in this World, than to *Eternal Flames* in another. But we have not so *Learned Christ*, we dare not deal so inhumanely with them in this World, much less judge so uncharitably as to another, of those who profess to *Fear God and work Righteousness*, though they be not of the same Opinion or Communion with us. Yet, we tell Men of the danger of *hazarding their Salvation by erroneous Doctrines and superstitious Practices*, and suppose that sufficient to persuade such who sincerely regard their future *Happiness* to avoid all such things as tend so much to their *eternal Ruin*. And such who will continue in such things, meerly because there is a *possibility* some Persons may be saved in them by reason of *Ignorance or Repentance*, are no wiser Men than such, who should *split their ship upon a Rock*, because some have escaped upon a *plank* notwithstanding. So that considering on what terms we grant this *possibility* of *Salvation*, this *Concession* of ours can be no Argument at all to judge yours to be the *safer way*; and if upon the same terms you deny it to us, it shews how much more *unsafe* your way is, where there is so much of *Interest* and so little *Charity*.

But you attempt to prove against all Protestants whatsoever, that yours is the *safer way* to *Salvation*: Your First Argument in short is, *Because we grant that you may be saved upon your own Principles, but you deny that we may be saved upon yours*. And what is there more in this Argument (but a multitude of Words to little purpose) than there is in that which his Lordship Examines? For the main force of it lies in this, That is the *safest way* which both Parties are agreed in; and therefore although you would have your *Major Proposition* put out of all doubt, yet that wants more proof than I doubt you are able to give it. For although we grant, Men may be saved who have true *Faith, Repentance*, and a holy *Conversation* without any such *Sacrament of Penance*, which you make necessary for conveying the *grace of Justification*; yet what security can thence come to a Man in the choice of his Religion, since we withal say, That where there is a continuance in the corruptions and errors of your Church, it is hard to conceive there should be that *Faith and Repentance* which we make necessary to *Salvation*. You go therefore on a very false supposition, when you take it for granted that we acknowledge, that all those whom you admit to your *Sacrament of Penance* have all things upon our own Principles which are necessary to *Salvation*. And so your *Minor* is as false as your *Major* uncertain, viz. That many are saved in the Roman Church according to the Principles which are granted on both sides. But you would seem to prove, That all admitted by you at death to the *Sacrament of Penance* (as you call it) have all things necessary to *Salvation* upon Protestant Principles, because, you say, That *Faith, Hope, true Repentance, and a Purpose of Amendment* are necessary to the due receiving the *Sacrament of Penance*, and these are all which Protestants make necessary to *Salvation*. But supposing, that, Is it necessary that all those things must be in them, which make the necessary requisites to this *Sacrament* of yours? Do none receive this unworthily, as many do a far greater *Sacrament* than this, granting it to be any at all? It seems *Salvation* is very easie to be had in your Church then, for this *Sacrament* is supposed by you, to be given to Men upon their *Death-beds*; when, you say, It cannot be supposed that Men will omit any thing necessary for the attaining *Salvation*; and by virtue of this *Sacrament* they receive the *Grace of Justification*, whereby of Sinners, they are made the *Sons of God, and Heirs of Eternal Life*. But I assure you, we who believe, Men must be saved only by the terms of the Gospel, make no such

§. 4.
P. 301.

P. 302.

such easie matter of it as you do; we profess the necessity of a through-*renovation* of *Heart and Life* to be indispensable in order to *Happiness*, for *without Holiness no Man shall see the Lord*: and although we take not upon us to judge the final estate of Men whose *Hearts* we know not; yet the *Gospel* gives us very little ground to think, that such who defer the Work of their *Salvation* to their *Death-beds*, shall ever attain to it; The main design of *Christian Religion* being, The turning Mens Souls from *Sin* to *God* in order to the serving him in this World, that they may be *happy* in another. For if *Salvation* depended on no more than you require, the greatest part of the *Gospel* might have been spared, whose great End is to persuade Men to *holiness of Heart and Life*. It is not a meer purpose of amendment, when Men can sin no longer, that we make only necessary to *Salvation*: But so hearty a repentance of *Sin* past, as to carry with it an effectual reformation; without this, Men may flatter themselves into their own ruin by your *Sacraments of Penance* and such contrivances of Men, but there can be no grounded hopes of any freedom from eternal Misery. And their *Faith*, too, must be as weak as their *Repentance* shallow, who dare venture their Souls in another World, upon no better security than that By receiving the *Sacrament of Penance* they are made the *Sons of God, and Heirs of Eternal Life*. But you betray Men into stupid ignorance and carelessness as to their Eternal Salvation, and then deal most unfaithfully with them, by telling them, That a *Death-bed Repentance* will suffice them, and the *Sacrament of Penance* will presently make them *Heirs of Eternal Life*. So that although your *Doctrine* be very unreasonable, and your *Superstitions* very gross, yet this unfaithfulness to the Souls of Men makes all true lovers of *Christian Religion*, and of the *Salvation* of Mens Souls, more averse from your *Doctrine* and *Practices*, than any thing else whatsoever. For what can really be more pernicious to the World, than to flatter them into the hopes of *Salvation* without the performance of those things, which, if the *Gospel* be true, are absolutely necessary in order to it? How quietly do you permit the most stupid ignorance in such who are the zealous practisers of *Fopperies* and *Superstitions*? What excellent arts have you to allure debauchees upon their *Death-beds* to you, by promising them that in another World, which our Principles will not allow us to do? How many ways have you to get the pardon of *Sin*, or at least to delude People with the hopes of it, without any serious turning from *Sin* to *God*? What do your *Doctrines* of the sufficiency of bare *Contrition*, and the *Sacraments* working *Grace ex opere operato*, of *Indulgences*, *Satisfactions*, regulating the *Intention*, and the like tend to, but to supersede the necessity of a holy Life? And at last you exchange the inward hatred and mortification of *Sin*, for some external severities upon Mens Bodies; which is, only beating the *Servant* for the *Master's* fault. So that it is hard to imagine any *Doctrine* or way of *Religion* which owns *Christianity*, which doth with more apparent danger to the Souls of Men undermine the Foundations of *Faith* and *Obedience* than yours doth. And as I have at large shewed the former, How destructive your Principles are to the grounds of *Faith*; so it hath been fully and lately manifested by a learned *Bishop* of our Church, What *Doctrines* and *Practices* are allowed in your Church, which in themselves, or their immediate consequences, are direct *Impieties*, and give warranty to a wicked Life.

Bishop Taylors
Dissuasive
from Popery.
Chap. 2.

§. 5.

P. 302.

Which being so of your own side, we must see what Reasons you give for your most uncharitable Censure, That there are very few or none among Protestants that escape damnation: And this you call, The *Doctrine* of Catholics. The *Doctrine* rather of a proud, tyrannical, and uncharitable Faction of Men; who that they might gain *Profelytes* to themselves, shew

how

how little they are themselves the *Profelytes* of *Christ*. But you offer us a reason for it: *Because all Catholicks hold, That neither Faith, nor Hope, nor any Repentance can save us, but that only which is joyned with a perfect Love of God; without the Sacrament of Penance actually and duely received: And because Protestants reject this, they cannot be saved.* But you are not at all the less excusable, because you assert such *Doctrines* from whence such *uncharitableness* follows, but the dreadful consequence of such *Doctrines* ought rather to make you question the *truth* of them. For, can any One who knows and understands *Christianity* ever believe, that although he had a most hearty repentance for Sin, and a most sincere love to God, he should eternally perish, because he did not confess his Sins to a *Priest*, and receive *absolution* from him? I can hardly perswade myself, that you can believe such things, but that only such *Doctrines* are necessary to be taught, to maintain the *Priests Authority*, and to fright Men into that *picklock* of Conscience, the useful practice of *Auricular Confession*. To what purpose are all the Promises of *grace and mercy through Christ* upon the sincerity of our turning to him, if after all this, the effect depends upon that *Sacrament of Penance*, of which no precept is given us by *Christ*, much less any necessity of it asserted in order to eternal Salvation? If this then be all your ground of condemning *Protestants*, they may rejoyce in this, That your Reasons are as weak as your Malice strong. But it would be more fit for you to enquire, whether such who live and die in such a height of uncharitableness (whether with or without the *Sacrament of Penance*) can be in any capacity of eternal Salvation? For that is a plain violation of the *Laws of Christ*, this other even among yourselves a disputable *Institution* of *Christ*; and by many said, not to be at all of that necessity, which you suppose it to be. For neither *Medina*, nor *Maldonate*, even since the *Council of Trent* dare affirm, the denial of your *Sacrament of Penance* to be *Heresie*; and must then the Souls of all *Protestants* be sent to Hell, for want of that, which it is questionable, whether it were *Instituted* by *Christ* or no. But if this *Sacrament of Penance* be so necessary to Salvation, that they cannot be saved who want it, What becomes then of all the *Primative Church* which was utterly a stranger to your *Sacrament of Penance* (as shall be manifested when you desire it)? what becomes of the *Greek Church* which as peremptorily denies the necessity of it as *Protestants* do? Both which you may find confessed and proved by *Father Barns*, and many testimonies of your own Authors are brought by him against the *Divine Institution* and necessity of it. Who very ingenuously confesses, *That by the Law of Christ, such a one by the sentence of very many Catholicks, may be pronounced absolved before God, who manifests the truth of his Faith and Charity, although he discovers not a word of the number or weight of his sins.* What unreasonable, as well as uncharitable, men are you then to assert, *That no Protestants can escape damnation for want of that*, which so many among yourselves make unnecessary for the pardon of Sin? But it is just with God, that those who are so ready to condemn others, should be condemned by themselves: and if your Consciences do not condemn you here, your Sentence may be the greater in another World.

Your second Argument against *Protestants*, is, *Because they want certainty of Faith by denying the Infallibility of Church and Councils*; but this hath been so thoroughly sifted already, that I suppose none who have read the preceding Discourses, will have the least cause to stick at this: and therefore

P. 303.

Medina de Confess. 17. 2. qu. 4. Maldon. de Sacram. T. 2. c. 3.

Cum stando in lege Christi præcise pronunciari possit, ex plurimorum Catholicorum sententia absolutus coram Deo;—qui manifestis indiciis probat severam habere fidem & charitatem, etsi nō verbum propelet de numero, & gravitate peccatorum suorum. Barns lect. 8. de pœnit. chufess. & satisfactione.

§. 6.
P. 304.

- therefore we proceed to the Vindication of your Censures from being guilty of the want of Charity. For you are the Men, who would have us thank God, when you condemn us to Hell, that we escape so; and are angry with us, that we do not believe that you most entirely love us, when you judge us to eternal Flames. For, you say, That your denial of Salvation to us is grounded even upon Charity. If it be so, you are the most charitable People in the World, for you deny Salvation to all but yourselves and some Heathens. But, say you, If Salvation may be had in your Church as Protestants confess, and there be no true Church or Faith but One, it follows that out of your Church there is no Salvation to be had. To which his Lordship had fully answered, by saying, 'Tis true, there is but One true Faith, and but One true Church; but that One both Faith and Church is the Catholick Christian, not the particular Roman. So that this passage is a meer begging the question, and then threatening upon it, without all Reason or Charity. And all your declamations about the way of knowing the Doctrine of the Catholick Church, have been spoiled by what hath been said already upon that Subject. We come therefore to that which is the proper Business of this Chapter, which is, to examine the strength of that Inference which is drawn from the Protestants Concession of the possibility of Salvation in your Church, viz. That thence it follows, that the Roman Church and Religion is the safer way to Salvation. Two things his Lordship observes the force of this Argument lies in, the one directly expressed, viz. The Consent of both Parties of the possibility of Salvation in the Roman Church; the other upon the By, viz. That we cannot be saved, because we are out of the Church. And of these two he speaks in order. First he begins with the confession: as to which, his Answer lies in three Things, 1. That this was the way of the Donatists of old, and would hold as well for them, as the Church of Rome. 2. That if the Principle on which this Argument proceeds be true, it will be more for the advantage of Protestants than of your Church. 3. That the Principle it self is a contingent Proposition, and may justify the greatest Heresies in the World. By this methodizing his Lordship's Discourse, we shall the better discern the strength of your Answers to the several particulars of it. In the first place he shews, How parallel this is with the proceedings of the Donatists; for both parts granted, that Baptism was true among the Donatists, but the Donatists denied it to be true baptism among the Catholick Christians; and therefore on this Principle the Donatists side is the surer side, if that Principle be true, That it is the safest taking that way which the differing Parties agree on. To this you answer nothing, but what will still return upon yourselves, and discover the weakness of your Argument. For the Crimes of Schism, and unsoundness of Faith, are still as chargeable upon you, though we may grant a possibility of Salvation to some in your Church. And I cannot possibly discern any difference between the Judgment of the Catholicks concerning the Donatists, and ours concerning you; for, if they judged the Donatists way very dangerous because of their uncharitableness to all others, so do we of yours; but if they, notwithstanding that, hoped that the misled People among them might be saved; that is as much as we dare say concerning you. And you very much mistake, if you think the contrary. For his Lordship no where saith, as you would seem to impose upon him, That a man may live and dye in the Roman Church, and that none of his errors shall hinder Salvation, whatsoever motives he may know to the contrary. But on the other side, he plainly saith, That he that lives in the Roman Church, with a resolution to live and dye in it, is presumed to believe as that Church believes. And he that doth so, I will not say, is as guilty, but guilty he is more or less, of the Schism which that Church

first
And
and
then
the
wel
this
which
own
the
ger
per
in
and
is
cer
the
An
tio
th
ho
or
P
m
th
of
F
ti
y
i
I
n
t
c
i
c
c

first caused by her Corruptions, and now continues by them and her Power together. And of all her damnable Opinions too, and all other Sins also, which the Doctrine and mis-belief of that Church leads him into, Judge you now, I pray, Whether we think otherwise of those in your Church, than the Orthodox did of the Donatists? So that if the Argument doth hold for you, it would as well have held for them too. And therefore his Lordship well infers, That this Principle, That where two Parties are dissenting, it is safest believing that in which both Parties agree, or which the Adversary confesses, may lead Men, by your own confession, into known and damnable Schism and Hereſie; for such, you say, the Donatists were guilty of. And such, his Lordship saith, there is great danger of, in your Church too; for, saith he, in this present Case there's peril, great peril of damnable, both Schism and Hereſie, and other Sins, by living and dying in the Roman Faith, tainted with so many Superſtitious, as at this Day it is, and their tyranny too boot. I pray now bethink yourself, What difference is there, between the Orthodox Judgment of the Donatists, and ours, concerning your Church? And therefore the Comparison between Petilian the Donatists, and his Lordship's Adversary holds good still; for, all your Answer depends upon a mistake of Protestants granting a possibility of Salvation, as I have already shewed you. And, in what way soever you limit this agreement, you cannot possibly avoid, but that it would equally hold as to the Donatists, too; for the Concession was then as great, in order to Salvation, as it is now.

P. 298.

P. 315.

But you say, Whether he asserts it or no, it must needs follow from the Bishops Principles, that there can be no peril of damnation by living and dying in the Roman Church, because he professedly exempts the Ignorant, and grants as much of those who do wittingly and knowingly associate themselves to the gross Superſtitious of the Roman Church, if they hold the Foundation Christ, and live accordingly; From whence you argue, That if neither voluntary nor involuntary superstition can hinder from Salvation, then there is confessedly no peril of damnation in your Church. And yet his Lordship saith, All Protestants unanimously agree in This, That there is great peril of damnation for any Man to live and dye in the Roman Persuasion. And therefore (saith he) that is a most notorious slander, where you say, that they which affirm this peril of damnation, are contradicted by their own more learned Brethren. By which we see the injustice of your proceeding, in offering to wrest his Lordship's words contrary to his express meaning: And since all your Argument depends upon your Adversaries Confession, you ought to take that confession in the most clear and perspicuous terms, and to understand all obscure expressions suitably to their often declared sense. Which if you had attended to, you would never have undertaken to prove that his Lordship grants, that there is no peril of damnation in your Church, which he so often disavows, and calls it, a most notorious slander; and, a most loud untruth, which no engenuous man would ever have said. And even of those persons whom he speaks most favourably of, he saith, That although they wish for the abolishing the Superſtitious in use, yet all he grants them is, a possibility of Salvation, but with extream hazard to themselves, by keeping close to that which is Superſtition, and comes so near Idolatry. Are these then such expressions which import no peril of damnation in the Roman Church? And therefore when he speaks of the possibility of the Salvation of such who associate themselves wittingly and knowingly to the gross Superſtitious of the Romish Church; he declares sufficiently, that he means it not of those who do in heart approve of them, but only of Such, who though they are convinced they are gross Superſtitious, yet think, they may communicate with those who use them, as long as they do not approve of them. Which error of theirs, though he looks on it as dangerous, yet not as wholly destructive

§. 7.

P. 302.

P. 301.

P. 316.

structive of Salvation. But since, your Answer to this is, *That he mistakes very much, in supposing such Persons to belong to your Church and Communion*: you are not aware, How much thereby you take off from the Protestants Confession, since those whom we contend for a Possibility of Salvation for, are such only whom you deny to be of your Church's Communion, and so the Argument signifies much less by your Confession, than it did before. Thus we see, how this Argument upon the same terms you manage it against us, would have held as well in the behalf of the Donatists against the Communion of the Catholick Church. For what other imper- tinences you mix here and there, it is time now to pass them over, since the main Grounds of them have been so fully handled before.

§. 8.

P. 316.

P. 308.

P. 308.

P. 303.

We therefore proceed to the *Second Answer* his Lordship gives to this Argument, viz. *That if the Principle on which it stands, doth hold, it makes more for the Advantage of Protestants, than against them.* For if that be safest which both Parties are agreed in, then 1. You are bound to believe with us in the Point of the Eucharist. For all sides agree in the Faith of the Church of England, that in the most blessed Sacrament, the worthy Receiver is by his Faith made spiritually partaker of the true and real body and Blood of Christ, truly and really, and of all the benefits of his Passion. Your Roman Catholicks add a manner of this presence, Transubstantiation, which many deny; and the Lutherans Consubstantiation, which more deny. If this Argument be good then, even for this consent it is safer Communicating with the Church of England, than with the Roman or Lutheran; because all agree in this Truth, not in any other Opinion, You say, This can hold no farther than Communicating in the belief of this Opinion; let that be granted; and, Doth it not then follow, that the Church of England's Opinion is the safest upon your own ground? No, say you, for it is not such a common consent as doth exclude the manner of Presence, by trans. or consubstantiation. But, How senseless an Answer is this! for the Argument proceeds so far as all are agreed: and the Church of England asserting that real presence which all acknowledges simply necessary in order to the effects of it; her Communion is more desirable on this account, than of either of those Churches which offer to define the manner of Christ's presence, since even the greatest Men of your persuasion, as Suarez and Bellarmine, assert the belief of Transubstantiation not to be simply necessary to Salvation, and that the manner of it is secret and ineffable. It is therefore quite beside the purpose, when you offer to prove, that Suarez believed Transubstantiation: for, although he did so, yet since he grants it not simply necessary to do it; his Lordship's Argument in behalf of the Church of England holds firm still, unless you can prove, that Suarez held the belief of that to be as necessary as the belief of the real and Spiritual presence of Christ. But you, after, attempt at large to prove, that the real Participation of Christ in the Sacrament in your sense, is quite different from that of Protestants: If you mean a corporal Participation, indeed it is so; but that is not it, which is now enquired after; but, whether you do not allow any real and Spiritual presence of Christ, besides the corporal manducation of that you call his Body by Transubstantiation. If you do not, you would do well to shew, what effects that hath upon the Souls of Men; if you do, then still the Church of England is of the safer side, which holds that in which all are agreed. Which is as much as we are here concern'd to take notice of, as to this Subject, the Controversie itself having been so lately handled. 2. His Lordship instances, in the Article of our Saviour Christ's descent, into Hell; both are agreed as to the Article of descent, but the Church of Rome differs in the Explication; therefore it is safer holding with the Church of England, which owns the Article

without

without defining the manner. But you say, He proceeds on a false supposition, for both are not agreed, what is meant by Hells, whether it be the place of the damned or no: But this doth belong to the manner of *Explication*, and not to the *Article* itself, which both equally own, and therefore the Church of England hath the advantage there. 3. He instances in the *Institution of the Sacrament* in both kinds; in which it is agreed by both Churches, that Christ did institute it so, and the Primitive Church received it so. Therefore according to the former Rule, it is safest for a Man to receive the Sacrament in both kinds. This (you say) is as little to the purpose as the former, because you do not agree that he did it with an intention, or gave any command, that it should be always so received, but still you are quite besides the business, for that is not our Question, but Whether it be more safe to adhere to that which Christ instituted, and the Primitive Church practised, as you confess yourselves; Or to your Church, which prohibits the doing that which you confess Christ, and the Primitive Church did? and we see how great your Charity is, when you deny a possibility of Salvation to those who assert that Christ's Institution is unalterable, or that all who communicate, are bound to receive in both kinds. For all other things concerning this Subject, I must refer the Reader to the precedent Chapter, in which they are fully discussed. 4. The dissenting Churches agree, that in the Eucharist there is sacrifice of Duty, and a sacrifice of Praise, and a sacrifice of Commemoration. Therefore it is safest to hold to the Church of England in this, and leave the Church of Rome to her Superstitions, that I say no more. Here you still pretend, you differ in sense; but all this is only to say, you assert more than we do; which we grant, but assert upon your Principle, that we are on the safer side. And so in the intention of the Priest you agree with us as to the necessity of matter and form, and therefore it is safer holding to that, than believing the necessity of the Priest's intention, which many deny. And if the Rule doth hold, as you assert, That that which both are agreed in, is safer than the contrary; it will hold in matter of Opinion too, that it is safer to believe no more is necessary to the Sacrament, than both Parties are agreed in. The last instance is, That we say, there are divers errors, and some gross ones, in the Roman Missal; but you confess there is no positive error in the Liturgy of the Church of England; and therefore it is safest to worship God by that, and not by the Roman Mass. This you Answer as all the rest, by running off from the business; for, you say, It cannot be safer to use that, because you Catholics say, That to use it in contempt of the Roman Missals is certainly damnable Sin, and destructive of Salvation. But as it is not material what you say in this Case, so it is not at all to the purpose; for, if your Rule holds good it must be safer; and, if it be not, you must confess the Principle is false, That what both Parties agree in, is the safest to be chosen in Religion. The same might be at large proved concerning the main things in difference between us, that, if this Principle be true, we have very much the advantage of you: as, You and we are agreed, that the Scripture is God's Word, but we deny that Tradition is so, therefore it is safer adhering to the Scripture, and let Tradition shift for itself. You and we are agreed that there are sufficient Motives of Credibility, to believe the Scripture; but we deny that there are any such Motives to believe the present Church's Infallibility; therefore it is safer to believe the Scripture, than the present Church. So that this Principle, if improved by these, and other Instances, will redound more to our advantage, than yours, considering that in the case we grant it as to you, it is joyned with a Protestation of the extreme hazard which those run, who venture on your Communion, on the account of it; but there is no such danger upon the agreement with us in those Principles which are agreed upon between us.

P. 317.

Ibid.

P. 318.

P. 306.

P. 319.

P. 307.

P. 320.

§. 9.
P. 188.

P. 308.

P. 311.

P. 321.

3. His Lordship answers truly, that this Proposition, That in Point of Faith and Salvation, 'tis safest for a Man to take that way which the Adversary confesses, or differing Parties agree in, is no Metaphysical Principle, but a bare contingent Proposition, and may be true or false as the matter is to which it is applied, and so of no necessary truth in itself, nor able to lead in the Conclusion. Because consent of disagreeing Parties, is neither Rule nor Proof of Truth. For Herod and Pilate, disagreeing Parties enough, yet agreed against Truth itself. But Truth rather is, or should be, the Rule to frame, if not to force agreement. And to prove this further, his Lordship shews, That if this Principle hold good, that 'tis safest to believe as the dissenting Parties agree, or as the adverse party confesses, a Man must be an Heretick in the highest degree, if not an Insidel For, 1. In the Question between the Orthodox and Arrian concerning the Consubstantiality of the Son of God with the Father; The Orthodox confessed that which the Arrians asserted, viz. that Christ was of a like Nature with his Father; but they added more, viz. that he was of the same Nature. Therefore upon this Principle it would be safest holding with the Arrians. 2. In the Question about the Resurrection; the dissenting Parties agree, that there ought to be a Resurrection from Sin, to the state of Grace; and that this Resurrection only is meant in divers Passages of Scripture, together with the Life of the Soul, which they are content to say is Immortal; but they deny any Resurrection of the Body after Death. And therefore if this Principle be true, it will be safest to deny the Article of the Resurrection. 3. In the greatest dispute about the Unity of the Godhead; all dissenting Parties, Jew, Turk, and Christian, and all sects of Christians, agree in this, That there is but One God; and so by virtue of this Principle, Men will be bound to deny the Trinity. 4. In the Article of the Divinity of Christ, The dissenting Parties agree fully and clearly, that Christ is Man; but the Hereticks deny him to be God: if it be therefore safest to go by the consent of dissenting parties, or the confession of Adversaries, it will be safest believing that Christ is a meer Man, and not God. From whence his Lordship most evidently proves, That this Rule, To resolve a Man's Faith into that, in which the dissenting parties agree, or which the adverse Party confesses, is a meer contingent Proposition, and is as often false as true. And in false in as great, if not greater matters than those, in which it is true. And where it is true, you dare not govern yourselves by it; the Church of Rome condemning those things which that Rule proves. And his Lordship justly admires, that while you talk of Certainty, nay, of Infallibility, you are driven to make use of such poor shifts as these, which have no Certainty at all of Truth in them, but infer Falshood and Truth alike. And yet for this also, Men will be so weak, or so wilful, as to be seduced by you. But now it is time to take notice, what Answer you return to these pregnant Instances which his Lordship uses; and you think to take of all this by one General Answer, viz. That the Rule speaks this precisely, and no more, viz. that when two Parties differ in one Point of Religion, 'tis in prudence safest to take that way wherein both Parties grant Salvation to be obtainable; but in the former Instances, Salvation was not allowed by the Orthodox to the dissenters. But, how poor an Evasion this is, will be very easily discovered. For, 1. If that Principle be true, it must be built on that which his Lordship disproves, viz. That when two Parties disagree, it is safest believing that which both consent in. For, let any Reasonable Man judge, on what account I ought to make choice of your Religion; you say, Because both Parties are agreed that Men may be saved in your Church: well then, I ask, Why I ought to believe that which both Parties are agreed in? Doth it not necessarily resolve itself into this Principle, That it is safest believing that which both Parties consent in? For if this be not safest, Why should I be more inclined by their consent, than otherwise? So that if you let go this, you let go the only Foundation

on

on which that Principle stands. For if the consenting parties may agree in a falsehood, What evidence can I have, but that this is one of those falsehoods they may agree in? And therefore it is far from being the safest way to venture upon that which the dissenting Parties agree in. And because Salvation is a matter of the highest moment, If the Principle will not hold as to matter of particular Opinion, much less certainly in the most weighty Affair of Mens eternal Salvation. And it ought to be a safe Principle indeed, which Men should venture their Souls upon, and not so uncertain Topical an Argument as this is. Or that it is so far from being a matter of prudence to make choice of Religion on such a Principle, that no Man can be guilty of greater Weakness or Imprudence, than by doing so. 2. If this Principle should be limited only to a possibility of Salvation, yet, as to that it is easie to discover, how false and uncertain a Principle it is, because it is generally the nature of Sects, to be uncharitable, and to deny Salvation to all but themselves: Whereas the Orthodox Christians in all Ages have hoped the best of those who were misled among them; and on this ground it would still be safer to be on the Sectaries, than the Church's side. You have therefore gained an excellent Principle for the advantage of your Church; which, if it hold for you, will hold as well for the most uncharitable Sectaries that are in the World. Nay, we may go somewhat further; and, What think you if Heathenism itself will be proved the safest way to Salvation? For many of you agree with them, That many of them might be saved, without any explicate Knowledge of Christ; but they deny, you can be saved by it: If then this Principle be sound, farewell the Church of Rome, and welcome Philosophy. If you say, They are only some among you who assert the possibility of the Salvation of Heathens; you know, the very same Answer will hold as to us; you confess, That many Protestants grant no more to you than you do to them, in order to Salvation. If you say, That Heathens may be saved only on supposition of a general Repentance; that is all that any of us say as to you. So that if the Argument will hold one way, it must the other too; and it argues, you are very much to seek for Proofs, when you make use of this to perswade Men to be of your Church. And you have no cause to triumph in the Conversion of such, who suffer themselves to be imposed on by so palpable a piece of Sophistry as this is. But your way is to deal with the weakest, and such as are capable of such easie impressions as these are.

His Lordship, from that which was expressed, comes to that which was implied in this Argument, viz. That we cannot be saved, because we are out of the Church. As to which, he saith, We are out of the Catholick Church, because not within the Roman. For the Roman Church, and the Church of England, are but two distinct Members of that Catholick Church, which is spread over the face of the Earth. If you can prove, that Rome is properly the Catholick Church itself, speak out and prove it. This you say, you have done already; but, how poorly, let the Reader judge. But, when you add, That in the day of account, the Roman Church will be found not an elder Sister but a Mother; it will be well for her, if it prove not, only in the sense wherein Babylon the Great is called so, viz. The Mother of Harlots and Abominations of the Earth.

The Controversie, you tell us, goes on touching Roman-Catholicks Salvation, And we must follow; though without breaking it into several Chapters, as you do, that so we may lay together all that belongs to the same Subject. And here his Lordship distinguishes the Case of such, whose calling and sufficiency gives them a greater capacity for understanding the Truth; and such, whom, as S. Augustin speaks, the simplicity of believing makes safe. So that there's no Question saith he, but many are saved in corrupted times of the Church, when their Leaders, unless they repented before death, were lost. Which he understands, of such Leaders,

P. 301.

P. 313.

P. 321.

Rev. 17. 5.
§. 10.
P. 222.

P. 214.

Leaders, as, refuse to hear the Church's instruction, or to use all the means they can to come to the knowledge of the Truth. For if they do this, *ex tunc* they may, but *He* reticks they are not, as is most manifest in S. Cyprian's Case of Re-baptization. But when Leaders add Schism to Heresy, and Obstinacy to both, they are lost without Repentance, while many that succeed them may be saved. That is, in case they hold these Errors *supinely*, not *perstinaciously*, nor *inheritably*, *confessionally*, &c. In such all endeavours be used after Truth and Peace, and all expressions of Charity showed to all who retain an internal Communion with the whole visible Church of Christ in the fundamental points of Faith. Such as these, he confesses to be inconsistent with Salvation, though their misleader *perish*. This is the sum of his Lordship's discourse. Which you call, a heavy Doom against all the Roman Doctors in general (for what you say before is a meer declamation and repetition of what hath been often examined.) But you ask, How could they be all lost, who by the Bishop's own Principles, were members of the true visible Church of Christ, by reason of their being baptized, and holding the Foundation? But, Doth his Lordship say, that all such as are within the Church, are undoubtedly saved? For he only saith, That no Man can be said simply to be out of the visible Church, that is baptized, and holds the Foundation. The most then that can be inferred merely from being within the Church, is only, the possibility of Salvation, notwithstanding which, I suppose you will not deny, but many who have a possibility of Salvation, may yet certainly perish. For many may hold the Foundation itself doctrinally, who may not hold it savingly; and therefore it is a pitiful inference, because he grants they are members of the Church, therefore it follows from his Principles, they cannot be lost. But you are in a very sad condition, if you have no other ground for your Salvation, but being members of that which you account the Catholick Church. When Christ himself saith, Every branch in me that beareth not Fruit he taketh away; How much more such, who have nothing else to plead for their Salvation, but that they are in the Church? It is not therefore the bare doctrinal holding that Faith which makes them members of the Church, which can give them a title to Salvation: unless all sincere endeavours be used to find out, what the Will of God is, and to practice it when it is known. But, you say, Your leaders did not refuse the Church's Instructions, for they taught as the Church taught for many hundred years together; and, What other means could they be bound to use than they did, to come to the knowledge of the Truth? Yes, there were other means which they most supinely neglected themselves, and most dangerously with-held from others, viz. the plain and undoubted Word of God, which is the only Infallible Rule of Faith. And let any Church whatsoever teach against this, it must incur the same Anathema which S. Paul pronounces against an Angel from Heaven, if he teaches any other Doctrine. Did those then take care of their own, and others Souls, whose greatest care was to lock the Scripture up from the view of the People, and minded it so little themselves; which yet alone is able to make Men wise to Salvation. But you take the greatest advantage of his vindication of S. Cyprian and his followers, for therein you say, He vindicates more the Roman-Catholick Doctors, who had always the Universal Practice of the Church on their side, which they opposed; and condemns Protestants, because, if S. Cyprian's followers were in such danger for opposing the whole Church, so must they be too, who, you say, have opposed the Church's Instructions given them by the voice of a general Council. But, Who is so blind as not to discern that all this proceeds upon a palpable begging the Question, viz. that the whole Church is of your side, and against us? which I have so often discover'd to be a notorious fallhood, that there is no necessity

P. 323.

John 15. 2

P. 324.

Ibid.

ty at all here to repeat it. But, if we grant you that Liberty to suppose yourselves to be the *whole and only Church*, you will not more easily acquit all your *Doctors*, then condemn *Protestants*, both Teachers and People. However, by this we see, that you have no other way to do the one, or the other; but by supposing what you can never prove, and which none in their wits will ever grant you.

The greatest part of the thirty seventh Paragraph in his Lordship's Book, is (you say) taken up with Personal matters, and matters of Fact, in which you will not interpose; and you might as well have spared your Pains in that which you touch, since they are spent only upon a bare asserting the Greek Church to be guilty of Fundamental Errors (which we have at large disproved at the very beginning; but, as his Lordship says, you Labour indeed but like a Horse in a Mill; no farther at night than at noon; the same thing over and over again; and so we find it almost to the end of your Book) and as vain an attempt to clear your Church from any Error endangering Salvation. For, Whether the Errors of your Church be Fundamental in themselves, or only by Reduction and Consequence; whether you hold all Fundamental Points literally, or no; yet if we prove you guilty of any gross, dangerous, and damnable Errors (as his Lordship asserts you are) that will be abundantly sufficient to our purpose, that, Yours cannot possibly be any safe way to Salvation. And, although we should grant your Church right in the exposition of the three Creeds, yet if you assert any other Errors of a dangerous nature, your right Exposition of them cannot secure the Souls of Men from the danger they run themselves upon, by embracing the other. So much for the Argument drawn from the possibility of Salvation in the Roman Church.

P. 325;

P. 324;

P. 310;

C H A P. V

196:1.J.

The Safety of the Protestant Faith.

The sufficiency of the Protestant Faith to Salvation manifested by disproving the Cavils against it. T. C's. tedious Repetitions passed over. The Argument from Possession at large consider'd. No Prescription allowable, where the Law hath antecedently determined the Right. Of the Infallibility of Oral Tradition. That, contrary to the received Doctrine of the Roman Church; and in itself unreasonable. The Ground of it examined. The ridiculousness of the Plea of bare Possession, discovered. General Answers returned to the remaining Chapters, consisting wholly of Things already discussed. The place of S. Cyprian to Cornelius particularly vindicated. The proof of Succession of Doctrine lies on the Romanists by their own Principles.

Although this Subject hath been sufficiently cleared in the Controversie concerning the resolution of Faith; yet the nature of our task requires that we so far resume the debate of it, as any thing undiscussed already offers itself to consideration. For I cannot think it a civil way of treating the Reader, to cloy him with Tautologies, or Repetitions; nor can I think it a way to satisfy him, rather by some incidental passages, than by a full and free Debate. In all those things then, which we have had occasion to handle already, I shall remit the Reader to the precedent Discourses, but whatever hath the face of being new and pertinent, I shall readily examine the force of it. The occasion of this fresh Debate was a new Question of the Lady; Whether she might be saved in the Protestant Faith?

§. 1.

In

In answering whereof, you say, *The Parties conferring are put into new heats; Upon my Soul (said the Bishop) you may. Upon my Soul (said Mr. Fisher) there's but one saving Faith, and that's the Roman.* Since the confidence seems equal on both sides, we must examine, Which is built on the stronger Reason. And his Lordship's comes first to be examined; which he offers very freely to examination. For, saith he, *to believe the Scripture and the Creeds; to believe these in the sense of the Ancient Primitive Church; to receive the four great General Councils so much magnified by Antiquity; to believe all points of Doctrine generally received as fundamental in the Church of Christ, is a Faith, in which to live and dye, cannot but give Salvation.* And therefore, saith he, *I went upon sure ground in the adventure of my Soul upon that Faith.* Besides, in all the Points Controverted between us, I would fain see any one Point maintain'd by the Church of England, that can be proved to depart from the Foundation. You have many dangerous errors about the very Foundation, in that which you call the Roman Faith; but there I leave you to look to your own Soul, and theirs whom you seduce. Thus far his Lordship. Two things you seem to answer to this. 1. That such a Faith may not be sufficient, 2. That ours is not such a Faith. 1. That such a Faith may not be sufficient, because you suppose it necessary to believe the Infallibility of the present Church, and General Councils: But that we are now excused from a fresh enquiry into; but you would seem to infer it from his own principles of submission to General Councils. But by what peculiar Arts you can thence draw, that some thing else is necessary to be believed in order to Salvation besides what hath been owned as Fundamentals in all Ages, I am yet to learn. And sure you were much to seek for Arguments, when you could not distinguish between the necessity of external submission, and internal assent.

P. 328.

§. 2.

P. 329.

But the Second is the main thing you quarrel with, viz. *That the English Protestant Faith is really and indeed such a Faith:* and this you undertake at large to disprove. You ask first, *Whether we believe all Scripture, or only a part of it?* we Answer, *All without exception that is Scripture, i. e. hath any evidence that ever it was of Divine Revelation.* In this, you say, we profess more than we can make good, seeing we refuse many Books owned for Canonical by the Primitive Church, and embrace some which were not. But in both you assert that, which we are sure you are never able to defend; since we are content to put it upon as fair a tryal as you can desire, viz. *That the Church of England doth fully agree with the Primitive Church, as to the Canon of Scripture.* Which hath been already made good by the successful diligence of a Learned Bishop of our Church, to whom I refer you either for satisfaction or confusion. But you are the Men whose bare Words and bold affirmations must weigh more than the greatest evidence of Reason or Antiquity. You love to Pronounce, where you are loth to prove; and think to bear Men down with Confidence, where you are afraid to enter the Lists. But our Faith stands not on so sandy a Foundation to be blown down with your biggest Words; which have that property of wind in them to be light and loud. When you will attempt to prove that the Books call'd *Apocrypha* have had an equal Testimony of Divine Authority with those we receive into the Canon of Scripture, you may meet with a further Answer upon that Subject. Just as much you say to disprove our believing Scripture, and the Creeds in the Primitive Church; For, you say, *The Fathers oppose us, we deny it: you say, The Councils condemn us, we say and prove to the contrary.* You offer again at some broken evidences of the Pope's Supremacy from Councils and Fathers; but those have been discussed already: and the sense of the Church at large manifested to be contrary to it. But I fear your matters lye very ill concocted

Bishop Cosens
Scholastical
History of
the Canon of
Scripture.

P. 330.

cocted upon your stomach, you bring them us so often up; but I am not bound to dance in a Circle because you do so. And therefore I proceed; but when I hope to do so, you pull me back again to the *Infallibility of Councils* and the *Church*, the question of *Fundamentals* and the *Greek Church*; and scarce a page between, but in comes again the *Pope's Supremacy* as fresh, as if it had been never handled before. But I assure you after this rate, I wonder you ever came to an end, for you might have writ all your life-time after that manner. For the *decretal Epistles* (those impregnable testimonies) *S. Cyprian, Optatus, Hierom, Austin, the Council of Sardica, Ephesus, Chalcedon*, and all the baffled and impertinent proofs you think on, must be pressed to do new service, though they had run out of the Field before. And this you call a General Consent of the *Fathers of the Primitive Church*; but I must beg the Reader not to be scared with these *vizards*, for if he touches them they fall off, and then you will see them blush that they are so often abused to so ill an end. But this is not the only subject (*viz. the Pope's Supremacy*) which you give us so often over, but, within a Page or two following, enter again worship of *Images* with as much ceremony as if it had never appeared; but till you have Answered what I have said already, all that you have here is vain and impertinent: in the next Page enter *Transubstantiation*: in the following, enter again *Infallibility of Councils, Resolution of Faith, Apocrypha Books, Fundamentals, Communion in one kind, &c.* to the end of the Chapter. In all which I find but two things new, the one about *Purgatory*, which we shall meet with again; and the other you call a *Note* only by the way, but it is so rare a one, it ought to be considered.

P. 331.
P. 332.P. 334.
P. 335.

P. 337.

P. 338.
P. 339.

P. 333.

§. 34

Which is, That Protestants ought to prove their Faith agreeable to that of the *Primitive Church* by special undeniable evidence; but they have not the like reason to require it of you Catholics (good reason for it) but, you say, not that you are unable to do it, (no, who would ever suspect that, who reads your Book?) but because you are in full and quiet possession of your Faith, Religion, Church, &c. by immemorial tradition and succession from your Ancestors, that you do, upon that sole ground of quiet possession, justly prescribe against your Adversaries. And your Plea, you say, must in all Law and Equity be admitted for good, till they do by more Pregnant and Convincing Arguments disprove it, and shew that your possession is not *bona fidei*, but gain'd by Force or Fraud, or some other wrongful and unallowed means. To this, because I have not yet considered it, I shall now return the fuller Answer. And it appears that the proof lyes upon you: For they who challenge full and quiet possession by virtue of immemorial tradition and succession from their Ancestors, ought to produce the conveyance of that tradition from him who alone could invest them in that possession. For although this title of possession be of late so much insisted on by those who see the weakness of other Arguments and are ashamed to use them; yet whosoever thoroughly searches it, will find it as weak and ridiculous as any other. For it is plain in this case, the full right depends not upon meer occupancy, but a title must be pleaded, to shew that the possession is *bona fidei*; so that the Question comes from the bare possession to the goodness of the title and the validity of it in justice and equity. Your title then is immemorial tradition from your Ancestors: but here several things are to be contested, before your prescription be allowed, 1. That no antecedent Law hath determin'd contrary to what you challenge by virtue of possession. For if it hath, no prescription is allowable in it. For, prescription can only take place where the Law allows a liberty for prescription; but if the Law hath antecedently determin'd against it, possession signifies nothing, but the liberty

H h h h

Liberty to make good the Title I should say, Man be so mad, as to think that prescription of three score years would have been sufficient in the Jewish Law, when all possessions were to remain in their first Owners by Law, at every year of Jubilee. So then the Matter to be enquired here, is What Liberty of prescriptions is allowed by the Law of Christ; for since he hath made Laws to Govern his Church by, it is most senseless pleading prescription, till you have particularly examin'd, how far such prescriptions are allowed by him. Let us then suppose, that any of the Matters in difference between us, are one way or other determined by him; viz. Whether the Bishop of Rome be Head of the Church or no, Whether the present Church be Infallible or no. What do you say? Hath he determined these things, or hath he not? If he hath determined them one way or other, it is to no purpose in the World to plead possession or prescription; for these signifie nothing against Law. So that the Question must be wholly removed from the Plea of possession, and it must be tryed upon this issue, whether Christ by his Law hath determined on your side or ours? It may be you will tell me, That in this Case prescription interprets Law, and that the Church's Possession argues it was the will of Christ. But still the proof lyes upon your side, since you run yourself into new bryars; for you must prove that there is no way to interpret this Law, but by the practice of the Church, and which is the *regula veritas* of all, That the Church cannot come into the possession of any thing, but what was originally given her by the Legislator. Which is a task necessarily incumbent on you to prove, and I suppose you will find so much difficulty in it, that you had as good run back to *Super hanc Petram*, and *Pasce oves*, as undertake to manage it. He that undertakes to prove it impossible that the Church should claim possession by an undue title; must prove it impossible, that the Church should ever be deceived. And herein we see the excellent way of this proof. For suppose the matter in dispute be the Roman Church's Infallibility, this, you say, you are in possession of (though that be the thing in question), well, we will suppose it, that we may discern your proofs. I demand then, On what account do you challenge this? you say, By prescription. I further ask, How you prove this prescription sufficient? you say, Because the Church cannot challenge any thing but what belongs to her. I demand the proof of that: your Answer must be, Because the Church cannot be deceived; so that the proof at last comes to this, The Church is Infallible because she is Infallible.

§. 4.

Well, but suppose this Infallibility challenged, be only an Infallibility of Tradition and not a Doctrinal Infallibility in either Pope or Councils; Yet still I am unsatisfied as ever. For I ask, Whether am I bound to believe what the present Church delivers to be Infallible? Yes. On what account am I bound to believe it? Because the present Church cannot be deceived in what the Church of the former Age believed, nor that in the preceding, and so up till the time of Christ. But, 1. How can you assure me, the present Church obliges me to believe nothing, but only what, and so far, as it received it from the former Church? What evidence can you bring to convince me, both that the Church alway observed this Rule, and could never be deceived in it? For I see the Roman Church asserts, that things may be *de fide* in one Age, which were not in another; at least Popes, and Councils challenge this, and this is the common Doctrine maintained there, and others are looked on as no Members of their Church who assert the contrary; but as Persons, at least, meritoriously, if not actually, excommunicate. Where then shall I satisfy myself what the sense of your Church is, as to this particular? Must I believe a very few Persons whom the rest disown as Heretical

Heretical and Seditious Persons? or ought I not rather to take the judgment of the greatest and most approv'd in that Church? And these disown any such Doctrine; but assert that the Church may determine things *de fide* which were not so before: In which Case I ask, Whether, when a thing is *de novo* determined to be *de fide*, that Church believed as the precedent did, or no? If it did, How comes any thing to be *de fide*, which was not before? If it did not, What assurance can I have that every Age of the Church believes just as the precedent did, and no otherwise? when I see they profess the contrary. And if a thing may be *de fide* in one age, which was not in a forgoing, then a Church may deliver that as a matter of Faith at one time, which was never accounted so before: by which means the present Church may oblige me to believe that as a matter of Faith which never was so in Christ, or the Apostles times, and so the *Infallibility* on the account of Tradition is destroyed.

2. What security is there, that in no age of the Church any practices should come in, which were not used in the precedent? You may say, *Because they could not be deceived what their fore-Fathers did*: but that satisfies not, unless you prove that all the Church in every Age look'd upon itself as oblig'd to do nothing at all, but what their Fore-fathers did. For although they might know never so much what was done by them, if they did not judge themselves bound to observe unalterably what they did, this doth not hinder at all, but new customs and opinions might be introduced in the Church. And therefore I cannot but justly wonder, that any Men of parts who professedly disown the vulgar ways of establishing the Roman Church should think to satisfy themselves with Oral Tradition, and cry it up as so impregnable a thing. *Because no Age of the Church can be deceived in what the foregoing did and taught*. Whereas a very little of that reason, which these Men pretend to, might acquaint them, that the force of it doth not lye in their capacity to know what was done by others, but in their obligation not to vary at all from it. For the main weight of the Argument lyes here, *That nothing hath been changed in the Faith or Practice of the Church*, which being the thing to be proved, the bare knowledge of what was believed or practised, is not sufficient to prove it; for Men may know very well what others believe and do, and yet may believe and do quite contrary themselves. But the only thing to be proved in this Case is, That every age of the Church, and all Persons in it look'd upon themselves as obliged, not to vary in any thing from the Doctrine or practice of the precedent age. And I pray let me know by what demonstrative medium can this be prov'd; for no less than demonstrations are spoken of by the magnifiers of this way; although there be so little evidence in it, that it cannot work but upon a very weak understanding. Must that obligation, to observe all which the precedent Age believed or practised be proved by reason, particular Testimony, or universal Tradition? And let the Extollers of this way take their choice, so they will undertake to bring Evidence equal to the weight which depends upon it. It is hard to conceive what Reason should inforce it, but such as proves the impossibility of the contrary: And they have understandings of another mould from others, who can conceive it impossible that Men should not think themselves obliged to believe and do all just as their Predecessors did. If particular Testimonies could be produced, they signify no more, than their own Judgments; but we are enquiring for the Judgment of every age of the Church, and the Persons who lived in it. And to prove an universal Tradition of this obligation is the most difficult task of all, for it depends upon the truth of that which is to be proved by it. For if they did not think themselves obliged to believe and do what their Predecessors did, they could not think themselves bound to deliver such an obligation to their

posterity to do it. And therefore you must first prove the obligation itself; before you can prove the *universal tradition* of it. For although one Age may deliver it, yet you cannot be assured that a former Age did *intend* them; unless you can prove, the same sense of this obligation ran through them all. But this is so far from being an *universal tradition*, that the present Age from which it begins was never agreed in it, as I have shewed already.

§. 5.

3. It is to no purpose to prove the *impossibility of motion*, when I see Men move: no more it is to prove that no Age of the Church could vary from the foregoing, when we can evidently prove that they have done it. And therefore this Argument is intended only to catch easie minds that care not for a search into the History of the several Ages of the Church, but had rather sit down with a superficial subtilty than spend time in further enquires. For this Argument proceeds just as if men should prove the world eternal by this medium: The present Age sees no alteration in it, and they could not be deceived in what their Fore-fathers believed, nor they in theirs, and so on in *infinitum*; for no Man did ever see the World made: and therefore it was never made, and so eternal. But if we go about to prove by Reason the production of the world, or by Scripture to shew that it was once made, then this *oral tradition* is spoiled. And so it is in the present case; These Men attempt to prove there could never be any alteration in the Faith or Practice of the Church since Christ's time; for the present Age delivers what it had from the precedent, and so up till the first institution of the Church: but in the mean time, if we can evidently prove that there hath been such alterations in the Church, then it is to no purpose to prove that impossible which we see actually done. And this appears, not only because the Scripture supposes a degeneracy in the Christian Church, which could never be, if every Age of the Church did infallibly believe and practise as the precedent up to Christ's time did; but because we can produce clear evidence, that some things are delivered by the present Church which must be brought in by some Age since the Time of Christ. For which I shall refer you to what I have said already concerning *Communion in one kind, Invocation of Saints, and Worship of Images*. In all which I proved evidently, that they were not in use in some Ages of the Christian Church; and it is as evident that these are delivered by the present Church; and therefore this Principle must needs be false. For by these things it appears, that one Age of the Church may differ in Practice or Opinion from another, and therefore this *oral Tradition* cannot be infallible. And yet this is the only way whereby a *prescription* may be allowed, for this offers to give a sufficient title if it could be made good. But bare possession in matters of Religion is a most senseless Plea; and which would justify *Heathenism* and *Mahumatism* as well as your Church.

§. 6.

2. It were worth knowing, What you mean by full and quiet possession of your Faith, Religion, and Church, which you say you were in. Either you mean that you did believe the Doctrines of your Church yourselves, or that we were bound to believe them too. If you mean only the former, you are in as full possession of them as ever, for I suppose all in your Church do believe them; if you intend by this possession, that we ought to believe them because you did, this is a *prescription* indeed, but without any ground or reason. For even Tertullian whom you cite for prescribing against Hereticks, says, *That nothing can be prescribed against Truth, Non spatium temporum, non patrocinia personarum, non privilegium regionum. Neither length of time, nor Authority of Persons, nor privilege of places.* If you say, It was Truth you were in possession of, this is the thing to be proved; and if you can make that appear we will not disturb your possession at all. But you must be sure to prove

prove it by something else besides your *quiet and full possession*; unless you can prove it impossible that you should be possessed of falsehoods; But we have evidently shewn the contrary already. And if we examine a little further what this possession is, we shall see what an excellent right it gives you to prescribe by. You were possessed of your Faith, Religion, and Church, i.e. you did believe the Roman Church infallible, you believed the Pope's Supremacy, Transubstantiation, Purgatory, &c. And what then? Do you not believe them still? Yes doubtless. But, What is your quarrel with us then? Do we hinder you the Possession of them? No, but we ought to believe them too. But, Why so? Because you are in possession of them. What, Must we then believe whatever you do, whether it be true or false? If this be the meaning of your Possession, you ought well to prove it, or else we shall call it *Usurpation*. For it is a most ridiculous thing for you to talk of Possession, when the Question is, Whether there be any such things in the World or no, as those you say you are possessed of? We deny your Church's Infallibility, the Pope's Supremacy, Purgatory, &c. You must first prove there are such things *in rerum natura*, as Purgatory, Transubstantiation, &c. before you can say, you are possessed of them. You must convince us, that your Church is Infallible, and that the Pope was made Head of the Church by Christ; and then we will grant you are in full possession of them, but not before. So that you see, the Question is not concerning the manner of Possession, but of the things themselves, which you call your Faith, Religion, and Church, in opposition to ours; and therefore it is impossible to plead *Prescription*, where there never was any Possession at all. And therefore you clearly mistake when you call us, *The Aggressors*, for you are plainly the *Imposers* in this Case, and quarrel with us for not believing what you would have us; and therefore you are bound to prove, and not we. So that there is nothing you could challenge any Possession of in the Church of England, but some Authority which the Pope had, which you elsewhere confess he might be deprived of, as he was in King Henry's time; and which we offer to prove that he was not Possessor *bonæ fidei* of, but that he came to it by fraud and violence, and was deprived of it by a legal Power. Thus I have fully examined your Argument from Possession, because it presents us with something which had not been discussed before.

But having taken a view of all that remains, I find that it consists of a bare Repetition of the Controversies before discussed, especially concerning the certainty and grounds of Faith, the Infallibility of the Church, and General Councils, and the Authority of the Roman Church; So that if you had not an excellent faculty of saying most, where there is least occasion, I should wonder at your design in spending several Chapters in giving the same things, under other words. Unless it were an ambition of answering every clause in his Lordship's Book, which carry'd you to it, though you only gave over and over what you had said in many places before; which is a piece of *vanity* I neither envy you for, nor shall I strive to imitate you in; having made it my endeavour to lay those grounds in the handling each Controversie, that there should not need any such fruitless repetitions as you here give us. His Lordship, though he complains much of it, was forced by his *Adversaries* importunity to return the same Answers in effect, which had been given before by him in the proper places, but, whosoever compares what his Lordship saith, with what you pretend to answer, will find no necessity at all of my undergoing the same tedious and wearisome task. Instead therefore of a particular Answer, I shall give only some general *strictures* on what remains of these Subjects, where there is any appearance of difficulty

P. 342.

difficulty; and conclude all with the examination of your *Defence of Purgatory*, that being a Subject which hath not yet come under our enquiry. Your main business is to perswade us, *that yours is the only saving Faith*; which you prove by this, *The saving Faith is but one, yours is confessed by us to be a saving Faith still; therefore yours is the only saving Faith.* But if you had considered on what that confession depends, you could have made no Argument at all of it; for, when we say, *that your Faith is saving*, we mean no more but this, that you have so much of the common truths of *Christianity* among you, that there is a possibility for Men to be saved in your Church; but, Doth this imply, that yours is a *saving Faith*, in that sense wherein it is said, *There is but one saving Faith*? for in that Proposition it is understood of all those common fundamental Truths, which the *Christian Church* of all Ages hath been agreed in. And the saying, *There is but one saving Faith*, is of the same sense with the saying, *There is but one true Religion* in the World.

P. 351.

The substance of what you would infer from the saying of *Athanasius's Creed*, *Which if a Man keeps whole and inviolate* (as you would have it) is this *That a Man is equally bound to believe every Article of Faith.* But you cannot mean, that it is simply necessary to do it, for that you disclaim elsewhere, by your distinction of *things necessary from the matter and the formal Reason of Faith*; and therefore it can only be meant of such to whom those objects of Faith are sufficiently proposed, and so far we acknowledge it too, that it is necessary to Salvation for every Man to believe that which he is convinced to be an object of Faith. For otherwise such Persons must call in question *God's Veracity*; but if you would hence make it necessary to believe all that your Church proposes for matter of Faith, you must prove, that whatever your Church delivers, is as infallibly true, as if God himself spake; and when you can perswade us of this, we shall believe whatever is propounded by her.

P. 352.

When you say, *We cannot believe all Articles of Faith on the same formal Reason, because we deny the Church's Infallibility*, it is apparent, that you make the Church's Testimony the *formal Reason* of Faith; and that you are bound to prove the Church absolutely *Infallible*, before we can believe any thing on her account.

P. 353.

Neither doth it follow, *Because we deny that, therefore we pick and chuse our Faith*; for we believe all without reservation, which you, or any Man can convince us was ever revealed by God. As to what at large occurs here again, about the *Infallibility of Councils*; there is nothing but what hath been sufficiently answered on that subject; and so reserving the Question of *Purgatory*, which is here brought in by his Lordship, as a further Instance of the Errors of *General Councils*; I pass on to the two last Chapters: In which we meet again with the objected inconveniencies, from

P. 355. &c.

questioning the Infallibility of the Church and Councils, That then Faith would be uncertain, and private Persons might judge of Councils, and if they may err in one, they may err in all; as fresh as if they had never been heard of before. Only the Argument from *Rom. 10. 15.* *That because none can preach except they be sent, therefore the present Church is infallible*, is both new and excellent, on which account I let it pass.

P. 373.

P. 376, &c.

If your Church, with all her *Infallibility*, can do no more, as you confess, in reference to *Heresies*, but only secure the faithful members of the Church, who have due care of themselves, and perform their duty well towards their lawful Pastors; you have little cause to boast of the great privilege of it, and as little Reason to contend for the necessity of it, since so much is done without it, and on surer grounds by the *Scriptures*, and the use of other means which fall short of *Infallibility*.

P. 375.

P. 386.

In the beginning of your last Chapter, we have a large dispute concerning *S. Cyprian's* meaning, in his 45th Epistle to *Cornelius*, where he speaks of the

§. 8.

In the beginning of your last Chapter, we have a large dispute concerning *S. Cyprian's* meaning, in his 45th Epistle to *Cornelius*, where he speaks of the

the root and matrix of the Catholick Church, viz. Whether by that, the Roman Church be understood or no? His Lordship saith, No, and gives many Reasons for it; you maintain the contrary; but the business may be soon decided upon a true state of the occasion of writing that Epistle. Which in short was this; It seems, Letters had been sent in the Name of Polycarp Bishop of the Colony of Adramyttium, directed to Cornelius at Rome; but Cyprian and Liberatis coming thither, and acquainting the Clergy there with the Resolution of the African Bishops to suspend Communion either with Cornelius, or Novatianus, till the return of Caldonius and Fortunatus, who were sent on purpose to give an account of the proceedings there, the Clergy of Adramyttium upon this writing to Rome, direct their Letters not to Cornelius, but to the Roman Clergy. Which Cornelius (being it seems informed by some, as though it were done by S. Cyprian's Council) takes offence at, and writes to Cyprian about it. Who gives him in this Epistle the Account of it, that it was only done, that there might be no dissent among themselves upon this difference at Rome, and that they only suspended their Sentence till the return of Caldonius and Fortunatus, who might either bring them Word that all was composed at Rome, or else satisfy them, who was the Lawfully ordained Bishop. And therefore, as soon as they understood that Cornelius was the lawful Bishop, they unanimously declare for him, and order all Letters to be sent to him, and that his Communion should be embraced. This is the substance of that Epistle. But, it seems Cornelius was moved at S. Cyprian's suspending himself, as though it were done out of dis-favour to him; which Cyprian to clear himself of, tells him, That his design was only to preserve the Unity of the Catholick Church. For, saith he, we give this Advice to all those who the mean time had occasion to sail to Rome, ut Ecclesiæ Catholicæ radicem & matricem agnoscerent & tenerent; that they would acknowledge and hold to the Root and Matrix of the Catholick Church, by which his Lordship understands, the Unity of the Church Catholick; you, the particular Church of Rome. But it is apparent, the meaning of this Council was, to prevent their participation in the Schism. So that if, upon their coming to Rome, the Schismatical party was evidently known from the other (which they might, I grant, soon understand there, by the circumstances of Affairs) they should joyn themselves with that part which preserved the Unity of the Catholick Church. Which I take to be the true meaning of S. Cyprian. But in case the matter should prove disputable at Rome, and the matter be referred to other Churches, then by virtue of this Advice, they were bound to suspend their Communion with either Party, till the Catholick Church had declar'd itself. By this account of the business, all your Arguments come to nothing; for they only prove that which I grant, viz. That in case it appeared at Rome, which was the Catholick Party, they were to Communicate with it: but this was not, because the Catholick Party at Rome was the Root and Matrix of the Catholick Church (for on that Account the Party of Novatianus might have been so too, if Novatianus had been lawful Bishop) but their holding to the Root of the Catholick Church, would oblige them to Communicate only with that part, which did preserve the Unity of it. For the Controversie now at Rome was between two Parties both challenging an equal Right; and therefore if S. Cyprian had only advised them to Communicate with the Roman Church, because that was the Root and Matrix of the Catholick Church, his Advice had signified nothing; for the Question was not between the Church of Rome, and other Churches, in which case it might have been pertinent to have said, they should adhere to the Church of Rome, because that

that was the *Root*, &c. But when the difference was at *Rome*, between two *Bishops* there, this Reason had been wholly impertinent; for the only Reason proper in this case, must be such as must *discriminate* the one *Party* from the other, which this could not do, because it was equally challenged by them both. And had belonged to one as well as the other, in case *Novatianus* had proved the lawful *Bishop*, and not *Cornelius*. And therefore the sense of *Cyprian's* words must be such as might give direction which party to joyn with at *Rome*, on which account they cannot import any privilege of the *Church of Rome* over other *Churches*, but only contain this advice, that they should hold to the *Unity* of the *Catholic Church*, and communicate only with that party which did it. This Reason is so clear and evident to me, that this place cannot be understood of any privilege of the *Church of Rome*, above other *Churches*, that if there were nothing else to induce me to believe it, this were so pregnant, that I could not resist the force of it.

§. 9.
P. 366.

Cypr. p. 73.

P. 394.

Part 2. ch. 2.
• sect. 8, 9,

But besides this, his Lordship proves, that elsewhere *S. Cyprian* speaks in his own Person with other *Catholic Bishops*, *nos qui Ecclesia unus caput & radicem tenemus*, we who hold the Head and Root of one Church, by which it appears, he could not make the *Church of Rome* the *Root and Matrix* of the *Catholic*; this being understood of the *Unity and Society of the Catholic Church*, without relation to the *Church of Rome*: and *S. Cyprian* writes to *Cornelius*, that they had sent *Caldonius* and *Fortunatus* to reduce the *Church of Rome* to the *Unity and Communion* of the *Catholic Church*; and because no particular *Church* can be the *Root* of the *Catholic*, and if any where, *Jerusalem* might more pretend to it than *Rome*, and because *S. Cyprian* and his *Brethren* durst not have suspended their *Communion* at all, if they had looked on the *Church of Rome*, as the *Root and Matrix* of the *Catholic*, as *Baronius* confesses they did, all which things are largely insisted on by his Lordship, and do all confirm, that hereby was not meant any Authority or Privilege of the *Church of Rome* above other *Apostolical Churches*, which in respect of the lesser *Churches* which came from them, are called *Matrices Ecclesie*, by *Tertullian* and others. But you are still so very unreasonable, that though no more be said of the *Church of Rome*, than might be said of any other *Apostolical Church*, yet because it is said of the *Church of Rome*, it must import some huge Authority, which if it had been said of any other, would have been interpreted by yourselves into nothing: For so do you deal with us here; for, because it is said, that they who joyned with *Cornelius*, did preserve the *Unity of the Catholic Church*, therefore it must needs be understood, that the *Roman Church* is the *Root* of the *Catholic*. But he must have a very mean understanding, that can be swayed by such trifles as these are: For, was there not a *Catholic* and *Schismatical* party then at *Rome*? and if they who joyned with *Novatianus*, did separate from the *Catholic Church*, then they who were in *Communion* with *Cornelius*, must preserve the *Unity* of it. And, Would not this Argument as well prove the *Catholic* party at *Carthage* to be the *Root and matrix* of the *Catholic Church*, as at *Rome*? But such kind of things must they deal with, who are resolved to maintain a cause, and yet are destitute of better means to do it with. So that I cannot find any thing in all your Answer, but what would equally hold for any other *Church* at that time, which was so divided as *Rome* was; considering the great care that then was used to preserve the *Unity of the Catholic Church*. And what particularly *S. Cyprian's* apprehension was concerning the *Nature and Unity of the Catholic Church*, we have at large discoursed already, to which place we refer the Reader, if he desires any further satisfaction.

Your

Your whole *N. s.* depends on personal matters concerning the *satisfacti-*
on of the Lady's Conscience; but if you would thence infer, *That she did well*
to desert the Protestant Communion; you must prove that it can be no sin to
follow the dictates of an erroneous Conscience. For such, we say, it was
in her, and, you denying it, all this Discourse signifies nothing, but depends
on the truth of the matters in controversy between us. But you most noto-
riously impose on his Lordship, when, because he asserts *the possibility of Sal-*
vation of some in your Church, you would make him say, That it is no sin to
joyn with your Church: You might as well say, Because he hopes some
who have committed *Adultery* may be saved, therefore it is no sin to commit
Adultery. So that while you are charging him *falsely* for allowing dissimu-
lation, you do that which is more, in saying that which you cannot but
know to be a great untruth.

§. 10.
P. 399, &c.

P. 401.

If our Religion be not the same with yours, as you eagerly contend it is not,
let it suffice to tell you, That our Religion is *Christianity*, let yours be what it
will. And if it please you better, to have a name wholly distinct from us,
yours shall be called the *Roman Religion*, and ours the *Christian*. If you
judge us of another Religion from yours, because we do not believe all that you do,
we may judge you to have a different Religion from the *Christian*, because
you impose more by your own confession to be believed as necessary in or-
der to Salvation, than ever *Christ* or the *Apostles* did. And certainly the
main of any Religion consists in those things which are necessary to be
believed in it, in order to Eternal Happiness.

P. 402.

In your following Discourse, you are so far from giving us any hopes of
peace with your Church, that you plainly give us the reason, why it is vain to
expect or desire it; which is, That if your Church should recede from any
thing, it would appear she had erred, and if that appears, farewell *Infalli-*
bility; and then if that be once gone, you think all is gone. And while
you maintain it, we are so far from hoping any peace with you, that the
Peace of Christendom may still be joyned in the *Dutchman's Sign* with the
quadrature of the Circle, and the *Philosophers Stone*; for the sign of the three
hopeless things.

P. 403.

How far we are bound to submit to General Councils, hath been so fully
cleared already, that I need not go about here to vindicate his Lordship's
Opinion from falsity or contradiction; both which you unreasonably charge
it with, and that still from no wiser a ground, than not being able to di-
stinguish between the submission of Obedience and Faith. For his Lordship
saith, *It may be our duty not to oppose General Councils in case they err, and yet*
it may be no pride not to believe known and gross Errors of General Councils;
and I pray, What shadow of a contradiction; is here? And if it be pride in
us not to believe gross Errors imposed on us, Is it not much more intolera-
ble in them who offer to impose them? What Authority the Pope hath ei-
ther to order or confirm Councils, it is not here a place to enter upon again,
since it hath been so largely Discoursed of in so many places. But you
force me, though not to the repetition of matter, yet to the repeating my
saying that I will not, oftener than I should, but only to shew, how little
you deserve any further Answer.

P. 404. &c.]

P. 406.

There is nothing now remaining to the end of your Book, which hath not
been over and over, even in these last Chapters, but only a long discourse
touching *Succession*, which you shew yourself, of how little importance it
is, when, after you have endeavoured at large to prove the necessity of
Personal Succession, you grant, *That it is not sufficient without Succession of Do-*
ctrine too: And on that Account you deny the *Greek Church* to have a true
Succession

P. 409.
P. 410.

- P. 411. *Succession.* And in vindication of Stapleton, you say, *All the Succession which he and you contend for, is a Succession of Pastors, which hold entire both the Unity and the Faith of the Church.* So that it comes to this at last, that you are bound to prove a continual *Succession* of all that which you call the Faith of your Church in every Age from the Apostles time; if you would have us believe that Doctrine, or own your Church for the true Church of Christ. And therefore I conclude these general Answers with his Lordships words;
- P. 382. *If A. C. T. C. or any Jesuit can prove, that by a visible continued Succession from Christ or his Apostles to this Day, either Transubstantiation in the Eucharist, or the Eucharist in one kind, or Purgatory, or Worship of Images, or the Intention of the Priest of necessity in Baptism, or the Power of the Pope over a General Council, or his Infallibility with or without it, or his Power to depose Princes, or the publick prayers of the Church in an unknown Tongue, with divers other Points have been so taught; I, for my part, will give the Cause.* J.

C H A P. VI.

96.2.0

The Sense of the Fathers concerning Purgatory.

The Advantage which comes to the Church of Rome, by the Doctrine of Purgatory, thence the boldness of our Adversaries in contending for it. The Sense of the Roman Church concerning Purgatory, explained. The Controversie between the Greek and Latin Church concerning it. The Difference in the Church of Rome about Purgatory. Some general Considerations about the Sense of the Fathers, as to its being an Article of Faith. The Doubtfulness and Uncertainty of the Fathers Judgments in this particular, manifested by S. Austin the first who seemed to assert a Purgation before the Day of Judgment. Prayer for the Dead used in the Ancient Church, doth not infer Purgatory. The Pymate of Armagh vindicated from our Adversaries Calumnies. The general Intention of the Church distinguished from the private Opinions of particular Persons. The Prayers of the Church respected the Day of Judgment. The Testimonies of the Fathers in behalf of Purgatory, examined; particularly of the pretended Dionysius, Tertullian, S. Cyprian, Origen, S. Ambrose, S. Hierom, S. Basil, Nazianzen, Lanctantius, Hilary, Gregory Nyssen, &c. And not one of them asserts the Purgatory of the Church of Rome, S. Austin doth not contradict himself about it. The Doctrine of Purgatory no elder than Gregory I. and built on Credulity and Superstition. The Church's Infallibility made at last the Foundation of the belief of Purgatory. The Falsity of that Principle: and the whole concluded.

- §. I. **T**Hese general Answers being dispatched, there remains only now this Question concerning Purgatory to be discussed. Which being the great Diana of your Church, no wonder you are so much displeased at his Lordship for speaking against it; for by that means your Craft is in danger to be set at nought. There being no Opinion in your Church which brings in a more constant Revenue, by Masses for the Dead, and Indulgences, besides Casualties, and Deodands, by dying Persons, or their Friends, in hopes of a speedier release out of the pains of Purgatory. So that if this Opinion were once out of Countenance in the World, you would lose one of the best Arts you have of upholding the Grandeur of your Church. For then farewell Indulgences, and years of Jubilee; farewell all those rich Donations which are given by those at their death, who hope by that means to get

get the sooner out of the *Suburbs of Hell*, to a place of rest and Happiness. For, What Engine could possibly be better contrived to exhort the largest gifts from those whose Riches were as great as their Sins, than to persuade them, that by that means they would be sooner delivered out of the *Flames of Purgatory*, and need not doubt but they should come to Heaven at last? And, Would not they be accounted great *Fools*, that would not live as they pleased in this World, as long as they could buy themselves out of the pains of another? And by this means your *Church* hath not only eaten, but grown fat, by the Sins of the People; it being truly observed by *Spalatensis*, That the Doctrine of Purgatory hath been that which hath most enriched the Church of Rome; which he gives as the reason of the most zealous contending for that Doctrine among those of your Party, who find so much advantage by it. And we might easily believe there was something extraordinary in it, when you tell us; *It is therefore firmly to be believed by all Catholicks, that there is a Purgatory; yea, we are as much bound to believe it, as we are bound to believe (for Instance) the Trinity or Incarnation itself: because, since it is defined by the Church, we cannot lawfully, or without sin and peril of damnation deny or question this Doctrine.* We had need then look to ourselves, who look on this Doctrine as a meer figment, that hath no foundation at all either in *Scripture*, *Reason*, or *Tradition* of the *Primitive Church*; but much more had you need to look to yourselves, who dare with so much confidence obtrude so destructive a Doctrine to a *Christian Life*, without any evidence of the truth of it, to be believed as much as the *Trinity* or *Incarnation* itself; which expressions take them in the mildest sense you can give them, carry a most insufferable boldness with them. But these are not all the bold words which you utter on this Subject; for you say else where, *That Bellarmin doth not more boldly, than truly affirm, yea evidently prove, that all the Fathers, both Greek and Latin, did constantly teach Purgatory from the very Apostles times, and consequently that it must be held for an Apostolical Tradition, or nothing can be.* So then, if confidence would carry it, we must not only tremble at the fears of Purgatory; but we must firmly believe it as an *Article of Faith*, and as a most undoubted *Apostolical Tradition*.

But before we can digest these things, we must see a little more ground for them, than as yet we do; and therefore you must be content to hear our reasons, Why we neither look on it as a *matter of Faith* or *Apostolical Tradition*; in order to which nothing is more necessary, than to enquire what you mean by *Purgatory*. For as long as you can shelter yourselves under general words, you think you are safe enough; but when we once bring you to a fuller explication of your meaning, *Purgatory* itself is not half so evident as those *Impostures* are whereby you would maintain it. But for our clear understanding this Controversie, we must find out what your *Doctrine* is concerning it; for, as confident as you are of it, there are not a few among you who are afraid to declare what you mean by it, lest by that means the World should see how far it is from having Foundation either in *Scripture* or *Antiquity*. We are therefore told by some who either are ashamed of the Doctrine itself, or loth to betray their Cause (by declaring themselves) that your *Church* requires no more than to believe that there is a *Purgatory*, for which they avouch the *Council of Trent*, which only defines *That the sound Doctrine concerning Purgatory should be taught*. This was indeed necessary to be said by such who do not at all believe the *Roman Doctrine* concerning it, whatever they pretend; but rather agree with the *Greek Church* about the *Middle state of souls*.

De Repub. Eccl. l. 5. c. 8. Sect. 73.

P. 371.

P. 350.

- p. 411. *Succession:* And in vindication of Stapleton, you say, *All the Succession which he and you contend for, is a Succession of Pastors, which hold entire both the Unity and the Faith of the Church.* So that it comes to this at last, that you are bound to prove a continual *Succession* of all that which you call the Faith of your Church in every Age from the *Apostles* time; if you would have us believe that Doctrine, or own your Church for the true Church of Christ. And therefore I conclude these general Answers with his Lordships words;
- p. 382. *If A. C. T. C. or any Jesuit can prove, that by a visible continued Succession from Christ or his Apostles to this Day, either Transubstantiation in the Eucharist, or the Eucharist in one kind, or Purgatory, or Worship of Images, or the Intention of the Priest of necessity in Baptism, or the Power of the Pope over a General Council, or his Infallibility with or without it, or his Power to depose Princes, or the publick prayers of the Church in an unknown Tongue, with divers other Points have been so taught; I, for my part, will give the Cause.* J.

C H A P. VI.

96.2.1

The Sense of the Fathers concerning Purgatory.

The Advantage which comes to the Church of Rome, by the Doctrine of Purgatory, thence the boldness of our Adversaries in contending for it. The Sense of the Roman Church concerning Purgatory, explained. The Controversie between the Greek and Latin Church concerning it. The Difference in the Church of Rome about Purgatory. Some general Considerations about the Sense of the Fathers, as to its being an Article of Faith. The Doubtfulness and Uncertainty of the Fathers Judgments in this particular, manifested by S. Austin the first who seemed to assert a Purgation before the Day of Judgment. Prayer for the Dead used in the Ancient Church, doth not infer Purgatory. The Primacy of Armagh vindicated from our Adversaries Calumnies. The general Intention of the Church distinguished from the private Opinions of particular Persons. The Prayers of the Church respected the Day of Judgment. The Testimonies of the Fathers in behalf of Purgatory, examined; particularly of the pretended Dionysius, Tertullian, S. Cyprian, Origen, S. Ambrose, S. Hierom, S. Basil, Nazianzen, Lanctantius, Hilary, Gregory Nyssen, &c. And not one of them asserts the Purgatory of the Church of Rome, S. Austin doth not contradict himself about it. The Doctrine of Purgatory no elder than Gregory I. and built on Credulity and Superstition. The Church's Infallibility made at last the Foundation of the belief of Purgatory. The Falsity of that Principle: and the whole concluded.

§. i.

THese general Answers being dispatched, there remains only now this Question concerning Purgatory to be discussed. Which being the great Dianna of your Church, no wonder you are so much displeased at his Lordship for speaking against it; for by that means your Craft is in danger to be set at naught. There being no Opinion in your Church which brings in a more constant Revenue, by Masses for the Dead, and Indulgences, besides Casualties, and Deodands, by dying Persons, or their Friends, in hopes of a speedier release out of the pains of Purgatory. So that if this Opinion were once out of Countenance in the World, you would lose one of the best Arts you have of upholding the Grandeur of your Church. For then farewell Indulgences, and years of Jubilee; farewell all those rich Donations which are given by those at their death, who hope by that means to

get

get the sooner out of the *Suburbs of Hell*, to a place of rest and Happiness. For, What Engine could possibly be better contrived to exhort the largest gifts from those whose Riches were as great as their Sins, than to persuade them, that by that means they would be sooner delivered out of the *Flames of Purgatory*, and need not doubt but they should come to Heaven at last? And, Would not they be accounted great *Fools*, that would not live as they pleased in this World, as long as they could buy themselves out of the pains of another? And by this means your *Church* hath not only eaten, but grown fat, by the Sins of the People; it being truly observed by *Spalatensis*, That the Doctrine of Purgatory hath been that which hath most enriched the Church of Rome; which he gives as the reason of the most zealous contending for that Doctrine among those of your Party, who find so much advantage by it. And we might easily believe there was something extraordinary in it, when you tell us; *It is therefore firmly to be believed by all Catholics, that there is a Purgatory; yea, we are as much bound to believe it, as we are bound to believe (for Instance) the Trinity or Incarnation itself: because, since it is defined by the Church, we cannot lawfully, or without sin and peril of damnation deny or question this Doctrine.* We had need then look to ourselves, who look on this Doctrine as a meer figment, that hath no foundation at all either in *Scripture*, *Reason*, or *Tradition* of the *Primitive Church*; but much more had you need to look to yourselves, who dare with so much confidence obtrude so destructive a Doctrine to a *Christian Life*, without any evidence of the truth of it, to be believed as much as the *Trinity* or *Incarnation* itself; which expressions take them in the mildest sense you can give them, carry a most insufferable boldness with them. But these are not all the bold words which you utter on this Subject; for you say else where, *That Bellarmine doth not more boldly, than truly affirm, yea evidently prove, that all the Fathers, both Greek and Latin, did constantly teach Purgatory from the very Apostles times, and consequently that it must be held for an Apostolical Tradition, or nothing can be.* So then, if confidence would carry it, we must not only tremble at the fears of *Purgatory*; but we must firmly believe it as an *Article of Faith*, and as a most undoubted *Apostolical Tradition*.

But before we can digest these things, we must see a little more ground for them, than as yet we do; and therefore you must be content to hear our reasons, Why we neither look on it as a *matter of Faith* or *Apostolical Tradition*; in order to which nothing is more necessary, than to enquire what you mean by *Purgatory*. For as long as you can shelter yourselves under general words, you think you are safe enough; but when we once bring you to a fuller explication of your meaning, *Purgatory* itself is not half so evident as those *Impostures* are whereby you would maintain it. But for our clear understanding this Controversie, we must find out what your *Doctrine* is concerning it; for, as confident as you are of it, there are not a few among you who are afraid to declare what you mean by it, lest by that means the World should see how far it is from having Foundation either in *Scripture* or *Antiquity*. We are therefore told by some who either are ashamed of the Doctrine itself, or loth to betray their Cause (by declaring themselves) that your *Church* requires no more than to believe that there is a *Purgatory*, for which they avouch the *Council of Trent*, which only defines *That the sound Doctrine concerning Purgatory should be taught*. This was indeed necessary to be said by such who do not at all believe the *Roman Doctrine* concerning it, whatever they pretend; but rather agree with the *Greek Church* about the *Middle state of souls*.

*De Repub. Eccl.
cles. l. 5. c. 8.
sect. 73.*

P. 371.

P. 350.

But although the Council of Trent did not expressly define what they meant by Purgatory; yet the sense of the Council concerning it, is easie to be gathered from the comparing of places together in it. For the Council of Trent in the last Session when it passed the Decree of Purgatory refers us to two things, by which we may fully understand the meaning of it; For in the Preface to the Decree, it saith, *That the Catholick Church had, in this and former Oecumenical Councils, taught that there was a Purgatory; by which we may understand, What this Purgatory is, which was now decreed, and you say, we are bound to believe it as an Article of Faith.* Now in all the former Decrees and *Anathematisms* of the Council, there is no place which seems to concern the Doctrine of Purgatory, so much as the thirtieth *Anathema* of the sixth Session in these words, *Si quis ita reatum pœnæ æternæ deleri dixerit; ut nullus remaneat reatus pœnæ temporalis exsolvendæ vel in hoc seculo vel in futuro in Purgatorio, antequam ad regna cælorum aditus patere possit; Anathema sit.* If any one shall affirm that the guilt of eternal punishment is so forgiven, as that there remains no guilt of temporal punishment to be paid, either in this life, or hereafter in Purgatory; before there can be any entrance into the Kingdom of Heaven; let them be Anathema. From whence it evidently follows, that the Doctrine of Purgatory as it is taught by the Council of Trent doth depend upon this Principle, *That there is a guilt of temporal punishment remaining after the sin is pardoned, which temporal punishment is to be satisfied for, either in this life, or in Purgatory.* So that all those who are in Purgatory are there on that account, that they might satisfy the Justice of God for the temporal punishment of sin. For the guilt of moral sin being remitted by the merits of Christ, the punishment is supposed still to remain, which being exchanged from eternal to temporal by the keys of the Church, this punishment remains to be satisfied for, in the pains of Purgatory. But this punishment being temporal, the possibility of a release from them is necessarily supposed before the day of Judgment; for the Council of Trent in the Decree of Purgatory, declares that the Souls there detained are relieved by the prayers of the Faithful, and especially by the sacrifice of the Altar. Which in the 22d Session, it saith, *is offer'd pro defunctis in Christo nondum ad plenum purgatis, for the departed in Christ not yet fully purg'd.* So that the satisfaction of the debt of temporal punishment which remains when the sin is pardoned, and the translation of Souls from thence to Heaven by the prayers of the living and the sacrifice of the Mass, are the main Foundations of the Doctrine of your Church concerning Purgatory.

§. 3.

And this will further appear by the state of the Controversie between the Greek and Latin Church upon this Subject. For the main thing which the Greeks objected against the Latins, was this temporary punishment for sin, in a future state: For they say, in their *Apology* delivered into the Council of Basil, *We own no Purgatory fire, nor any temporary punishment by fire which shall have an end; for we received no such thing by tradition, nor doth the Eastern Church confess it.* And afterwards; *We deny that any Souls pass through this life to eternal fire; for in saying so, we should weaken the consent of the whole Church: and it is to be fear'd, if we should assert such a temporary fire, that People would be apt to believe, that all the fire in the other life were only temporary; by which means they would fall into such neglect and carelessness, that they would make the more fuel for eternal fire.* And therefore they conclude, *That they neither have nor shall assert any such Purgatory fire.* But you would seem to persuade us, *That the Contest between the Greeks and Latins was only, whether the fire of Purgatory were material or no; For you say, The Greeks in the Council of Florence never doubted in the least measure,*

Apolog. Grecorum de Igne Purgat. p. 66. ed. Salmas.

P. 398.

nor

nor denyed Purgatory it self, but only question'd, Whether the fire were material or metaphorical. But if you speak of those Greeks, who held to what was generally received in the Greek Church; you are very much deceived therein, for the sense of the Greek Church was fully delivered by them in this *Apology*, pen'd, as is supos'd, by *Marcus Ephesus* but the Year before at the Council of *Basil*; and herein they not only dispute against the fire, but against any such state of purgation after this life, by the undergoing any temporary punishment for sin. For thus that *Apology* ends; For these causes, the Doctrine propos'd of a Purgatory Fire is to be cast out of the Church, as that which tends to slacken the endeavours of the diligent, and which hinders them from doing their utmost to purge themselves in this Life, since another purgation is expected after it. Is not this plain enough for their denial of any state of purgation after this Life, by which Men might satisfy for the temporary punishment of sin, and be translated out of the state to the Kingdom of Heaven? And thence, although in the Bull of Union published by *Eugenius* 4. at the concluding the Florentine Council, no more was concluded, than that those penitents who departed this Life, before they had satisfied for their former sins by worthy fruits of Penance, should have their Souls purged after death, pœnis purgatoriis, with Purgatory Punishments, yet *Marcus Eugenius* utterly refused to subscribe it thus; which certainly he would never have done if all the Controversie had been only, Whether the fire were real or metaphorical. And the whole Greek Church utterly refused those terms of union, and therefore *Alphonsus à Castro* recounts the denying Purgatory among the Errors of the Greeks. The Greeks indeed do not believe that any Souls enjoy the beatifical Vision before the day of Judgment, and on that account they allow of Prayer for the dead, not with any respect to a deliverance of Souls out of Purgatory, but to the participation of their Happiness at the great Day. But there is a great deal of difference between this Opinion, and that of your Church; for they believe all Souls of Believers to be in expectation of the final Judgment, but without any temporary punishment for sin, or any release from that punishment by the Prayers of the living, which your Church asserts; and is the proper state of the Question concerning Purgatory. Which is not, Whether there be any middle state wherein the Souls of the Faithful may continue in expectation of the final consummation of their Happiness at the great day; nor, Whether it be lawful in that sense for the Church on earth to pray for departed Souls in order to their final justification at the day of Judgment, or in *St. Paul's* language, That God would have mercy on them in that day; but, Whether there be such a state, wherein the Souls of Men undergo a temporary Punishment for Sin, the guilt being pardoned, out of which they may be released by the Prayers of the living, and translated from Purgatory to the Kingdom of Heaven, before the day of Resurrection. This is the true state of the Question between us and the Church of Rome; and now we come to examine, Whether your Doctrine concerning Purgatory be either an Article of Faith, or Apostolical Tradition; which how confidently soever you may assert, we shall find your confidence built on very little Reason.

Which we may the easier believe, since there are so many among your selves, who do not think themselves obliged to own this Doctrine of your Church concerning Purgatory. Nay, we have not only the confession of several of your Party, that your Doctrine of Purgatory was not known in the Primitive Church, as *Alphonsus à Castro*, *Roffensis*, *Polydore*, &c. and of others,

Δὲ τὰ αὐτὰ νῦν καὶ τὸ πρὸς ἐκείνους δόγμα
μα τὸ καθάσκειν πνεύς ἀποκλήσειον ἀν
ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, ὡς καθύμιν ἐμποιοῦν
τοῖς ἀποβάτοις, ἐμπιπτόν αὐτοῦ μὴ πᾶ
σι τέτοις ἀγῶ ἵκεν καὶ τὸ πᾶσι
βίον αὐτοῦ ἐκκαθαίρειν, ὡς πρὸς δόγμα
μὴν ἐτίκει καθάσκειν. P. 93.

Alphons. à Ca-
stro. l. 12. tit.
purgat.

§. 4.

Picherellus de
Missa c. 2.
p. 150.

*Punitio ergo in Purgatoria est res in opinione
humana posita: quæ nec ex Scripturis nec
Patribus, nec Conciliis deduci potest firmi-
ter: Immo, (salvo meliori iudicio) oppo-
sita sententia eis conformior videtur.* Barns
Catholico. Rom. Pacif. sect. 9. I. D. ad
fin. Paralip.

others, that it cannot be sufficiently proved from *Scripture*, as *Petrus à Soto*, *Perionius*, *Bullenger*, whose Testimonies are produced by others; but there are some Persons of note among you, who have expressly denied the Doctrine itself, and confuted the pretended reasons which are given for it. *Petrus Picherellus*, saith, *There is no fuel to be found in Scripture, either to kindle or maintain the fire of Purgatory*; and which afterwards he largely disproves in his excellent Discourse *de Missa*. *Father Barns* acknowledges, *That the punishment of souls in Purgatory is a thing which lyes meerly in humane opinion, which cannot be firmly deduced from Scriptures, Fathers, or Councils.* Yea, (saith he, with submission to better judgments) the opposite opinion seems more agreeable to them. But later than these, you cannot but know, Who it is here at

home, that hath not only pull'd down the superstructure, but rased the very Foundations of your Doctrine of Purgatory in his discourse *de medio Animarum statu*: wherein he professedly disproves the Doctrine of your Church (though he is loth to own it to be so) in this particular, and shews at large, that it hath no foundation at all, either in *Scripture*, *Antiquity*, or *Reason*. But if your Doctrine of Purgatory be to be believed as an *Article of Faith*, and *Apostolical Tradition* if any be; How come these differences among your selves about it? How comes that Author not to be Answered, and his reasons satisfied? But if you be not agreed among yourselves, What this *Article of Faith* is, you are most unreasonable Men, to tell us, We are as much bound to believe it as the *Trinity*, or *Incarnation*. We ask you, What it is we are bound to believe? You tell us, according to the sense of your Church, *The Punishment of Souls in a future state, out of which they may be delivered by the Prayers of the Faithful, and translated into the Kingdom of Heaven*; Another he denies all this, and saith, We are in effect only bound to believe, That faithful Souls do not enjoy their full Happiness till the *Resurrection*, and that there is no deliverance at all out of any state in which Mens souls are after death, till the day of Judgement; and that the prayers of the Church, only respect that Day; but that the former Doctrine is so far from being an *Article of Faith*, that it is contrary to *Scripture*, *Antiquity* and *Reason*. If such a state of expectation wherein faithful Souls are at rest (but according to different degrees of grace which they had at their departure hence, and look for at the day of *Resurrection*, when they shall have a perfect consummation of their blifs) were all the Purgatory which your Church asserted, the breach might be far nearer closing as to this *Article*, than now it is. For although we find some particular Persons ready to give a fair and tolerable sense of your Doctrine herein; yet we cannot be ignorant, that the *General apprehension* and *sense* of your Church is directly contrary; and those Persons who have discovered the *freedom* of their judgments as to this end and other particulars, know how much it concerns them to keep a due distance from *Rome*, if they would preserve the *freedom* of their Persons. But you are not one of those that hath cause for any such fears: for whatever *Bellarmin* saith, you are ready to swear to it, and accordingly set your self to the defence of Purgatory upon his principles; which are far more suitable to the Doctrine of your Church, than to *Scripture* or *Antiquity*.

§. 5.

But because this Controversie is not managed between his Lordship and you about the sense of the *Scripture*, but the *Fathers* concerning it; I must therefore enquire, Whether your Doctrine of Purgatory were ever owned by the *Fathers* as an *Article of Faith* or *Apostolical Tradition*. And that I may the

the more fully clear it, before I come to examine your proofs for it, I shall lay down some general Considerations.

1. *Nothing out to be looked on as an Article of Faith among the Fathers, but what they declare, that they believe on the account of Divine Revelation.* As to all other things which they assert, we may look on them as *private opinions of particular Persons*, but not as such things which were received as *Articles of Faith*. For whatsoever is received as such, it must be wholly on the account of *God's revealing it*, who only can oblige us to believe with that assent which is required to *Faith*. And if it be so as to all other things, much more certainly as to the *future state of souls*, of which we can know nothing certainly without *Divine Revelation*. For since the *remission of sins*, and the *happiness of the future Life*, depend upon the *goodness and mercy of God*, we can define nothing as to these things any further than *God hath declared them*. If *God hath declared that remission of sins lyes in the taking away the obligation to punishment*, it will be a contradiction to say, That he pardons those whom he exacts the Punishment of sin, from purely to satisfy his justice; if he hath declared, that the *souls of the faithful are in joy and felicity as soon as they are delivered out of this sinful World*, it is impossible they should undergo *unsufferable pains*, though not to *eternity*. I dispute not now, Whether he hath so revealed these things, but that it is impossible for any thing to be looked on as an *Article of Faith*, but what hath clear *Divine Revelation* for it. And therefore, although many Testimonies of the *Fathers* might be produced one way or other, as to these things; when they speak only their own fancies and imaginations, and not what *God hath revealed*, they cannot, all put together, make the opinion they assert to be an *Article of Faith*. Nothing is more apparent, than that the *itching curiosity* of humane nature to know more than *God hath revealed*, concerning the future state of Souls, did betimes discover itself in the *Church*. But the strange diversity of these *Imaginations* were a sufficient evidence, that they speak not by any *certain Rule*, but according to their different *fancies*; and therefore that they did not deliver any *Doctrine of Faith*, but only their own private opinions. If you would therefore prove, that the *Fathers* did own *Purgatory* as an *Article of Faith*, you must not think it enough to prove; that one or two of the *Fathers* did speak something tending to it, but that all who had occasion to mention it, did speak of it as the *Doctrine of the Church*, and that which came from an immediate *Divine Revelation*.

2. *There is no Reason, That should be looked on as an Article of Faith, which, they who seemed to assert it most, did build on such places, which they acknowledged themselves to be very obscure.* For since they deduced it from *Scripture*, it is apparent that they did not believe it on the account of any *unwritten word*, or *Divine Revelation* conveyed merely by *Tradition*; and since they confess the places to be very *difficult*, it is unreasonable to judge, that they looked on that as a matter of *Faith*, which they supposed was contained in them. As for instance, *St. Austin* in several places asserts, that all things necessary to be believed are clearly revealed in *Scripture*, and withal he says, that the place *1 Cor. 3. 15.* is *very difficult and obscure*, and that it is one of those places in *St. Paul*, which *St. Peter* saith are hard to be understood; and therefore it is not conceivable that *St. Austin* should make any thing a matter of *Faith*, which he founds upon this place. And this is the great and almost only considerable place, which he or the rest of the *Fathers* did insist on, as to the nature of that *purgation* which was to be in a future state.

Aug. de fide & oper. c. 15, 16.

3. *That*

3. That cannot be looked on as an Article of Faith to such Persons, who express their own doubts concerning the truth of it. For whatever is owned as an Article of Faith by any Person, is thereby acknowledged to be firmly believed by him. Now upon our enquiry into the Fathers we shall find, the first Person who seemed to assert that any faithful Souls passed through a fire of purgation before the day of judgment, was St. Austin: but he delivers his judgment with so much fear and hesitancy, that any one may easily see that he was far from making it an Article of Faith. We must consider then, that in St. Augustin's time, there were many, who though they deny'd Origen's Opinion as to the Salvation at last of all Persons; yet were very willing to believe it, as to all those who dyed in the Communion of the Church, that though they passed through the flames of Hell for their sins, yet at last they should be saved; and for this they mainly insisted on 1 Cor. 3. 15. where it is said, *That some should be saved, but as by fire.* Such, say they, build upon the foundation gold, silver, precious stones, who to their Faith add good works: But they, hay, wood, and stubble, whose life is contrary to their Faith; and yet these latter, they asserted should come to Heaven at last, but they must undergo the torments of Hell first. Against these St. Austin writes his book *de fide & operibus*, wherein he proves that such as live in sin shall be finally excluded the Kingdom of Heaven; and when he comes to the interpretation of that place, he gives this account of it, That those who do so love Christ, as rather to part with all things for him than to lose him, but yet have too great a love to the things of the world, shall suffer grief and loss on that account. *Sive ergo in hac vita tantum homines ista patiuntur, sive etiam post hanc vitam talia quadam judicia subsequuntur; non abhorret, quantum arbitror, à ratione veritatis iste intellectus hujus sententia.* Whether, faith he, Men suffer these things in this life, or such judgments follow after it; I suppose this Sense of S. Paul's meaning is not dissonant from truth. So far was he from being certain of it, that he puts in, *quantum arbitror*, as far as I suppose; and yet he would not define, whether that loss which they were to suffer were only in this life or no. And, in his *Enchiridion* to Laurentius, where he disputes the very same matter, he saith, *Tale aliquid post hanc vitam fieri incredibile non est; & utrum ita sit queri potest, & aut inveniri aut latere, Nonnullos fideles per ignem quendam purgatoriam, quanto magis minusve bona pereuntia dilexerunt, tanto tardius citiusve salvari.* It is not incredible that such a thing should be after this life, and it may be enquired after whether it be found to be so or no, that some Faithful Souls pass through a purging fire, and are saved sooner or later according to the degree of their affection to worldly things. Will any Man in his wits think that St. Austin spake this of any matter of Faith, or that was generally received in the Church as an Apostolical Tradition? Did he ever speak so concerning the Trinity or the Incarnation of Christ which you parallel with Purgatory? What would Men have thought of him, if he had said of either of those Articles, *It is not incredible they may be true*, and it may be inquired into whether they be or no? Whatever then St. Austin's private opinion was, we see he delivers it modestly and doubtfully, not obtruding it as an Article of Faith, or Apostolical Tradition if any be. And the very same he repeats in his Answer to the first Question of Dulcitius; so that this was all that ever he asserted as to this Controversie. What you offer to the contrary from other places of St. Austin shall be considered in its due place.

4. Where any of the Fathers build any Doctrine upon the sense of doubtful places of Scripture, we have no further Reason to believe that Doctrine, than we have

Aug. de fide & oper. c. 16.

Enchirid. c. 69.

have to believe that it is the meaning of those places. So that in this case the enquiry is taken off from the judgment of the Fathers, and fixed upon the sense of the Scriptures which they and we both rely upon. For since they pretend themselves to no greater evidence of the truth of the Doctrine than such places do afford; it is the greatest reason that the Argument to persuade us be not the Testimony of the Father, but the evidence of the place it self. Unless it be evident some other way, that there was an universal Tradition in the Church from the Apostles time concerning it, and that the only design of the Father was, to apply some particular place to it. But then such a Tradition must be cleared from something else, besides the sense of some ambiguous places of Scripture, and that Tradition manifested to be Universal both as to time and place.

These things being premised, I now come particularly to examine the evidence you bring, That all the Fathers both Greek and Latin did constantly teach Purgatory from the Apostles times, and consequently that it must be held for an Apostolical Tradition or nothing can be. And as you follow Bellarmin in your way of proving it, so must I follow you; and he divides his proofs you say into two ranks. First, Such who affirm prayer for the Dead. 2. Such who in the successive Ages of the Church did expressly affirm Purgatory. First, with those who affirm prayer for the Dead; Which (you say) doth necessarily infer Purgatory, whatever the Bishop vainly insinuates to the contrary. The Question then between us is, Whether that prayer for the Dead which was used in the ancient Church, doth necessarily infer, that Purgatory was then acknowledged? This you affirm; for, say you, If there were no other place, or condition of being for departed Souls, but either Heaven or Hell, surely it were a vain thing to pray for the Dead; especially to pray for the remission of their Sins, or for their refreshment, ease, rest, relaxation of their pains, as Ancients most frequently do. From whence, you add, that Purgatory is so undeniably proved, that the Relator finding nothing himself sufficient to Answer, was forced to put us off to the late Primate of Armagh's Answer to the Jesuit's Challenge. Which, you say, You have perused, and find only there, that the Author proves that which none of you deny, viz. That the prayers and commemorations used for the Dead had reference to more Souls than those in Purgatory. But, you attempt to prove, That the nature and kind of those Prayers do imply that they were intended for other ends, than meerly that the Body might be glorified as well as the Soul, and to praise God for the final happy end of the deceased: Whereas that Answerer of the Jesuit would, you say, by his allegations insinuate to the Reader a conceit, that it was used only for those two reasons and no other; Which, you say, you must needs avouch to be most loudly untrue, and so manifestly contrary to the Doctrine and practice of the Fathers, as nothing can be more. A high charge against two most Reverend and learned Primates together: against the one, as not being able to Answer, and therefore turning it off to the other; against the other, for publishing most loud untruths, instead of giving a true account of the grounds of the Church's practice. It seems, you thought it not honour enough to overcome one, unless you led the other in triumph also; but you do neither of them, but only in your own fancy and imagination. And never had you less cause to give out such big words than here, unless it were to amuse the Spectators, that they might not see how you fall before them. For it was not the least distrust of his sufficiency to Answer, which made his Lordship to put it off to the Primate of Armagh, but because he was prevented in it by him, Who (as he truly saith) had very learnedly and at large set down other reasons which the Ancients gave for Prayer for the dead without any intention to free them from Purgatory. Which are not

K k k k

only

§. 6.

P. 306.

Answer to
the Jesuits
challenge,
p. 195.

only different from, but inconsistent with, the belief of Purgatory; for the clearing of which, and vindicating my Lord Primate from your calumnies rather than Answers, it will be necessary to give a brief account of his Discourse on that Subject. He tells us therefore at first, That we are here prudently to distinguish the Original Institution of the Church, from the private Opinions of particular Doctors, which waded further herein than the general intendment of the Church did give them warrant. Now he evidently proves that the Memorials, Oblations, and Prayers made for the Dead at the beginning had reference to such as rested from their labours, and not unto any Souls which were thought to be tormented in that *Utopian Purgatory*, whereof there was no news stirring in those dayes. This he gathers first by the Practice of the ancient Christians laid down by the Author of the *Commentaries* on Job, who saith, The memorials of the Saints were observed as a memorial of rest to the Souls departed, and that they therein rejoyced for their refreshing. St. Cyprian saith, they offered Sacrifices for them, whom he acknowledgeth to have received of the Lord Palms and Crowns; and in the Author of the *Ecclesiastical Hierarchy*, the Party deceased is described by him to have departed this life replenished with Divine joy, as now not fearing any change to worse, being come unto the end of all his labours, and publickly pronounced to be a happy Man, and admitted into the Society of the Saints; and yet the Bishop prays, that God would forgive him all his sins he had committed through humane infirmity, and bring him into the light and land of the living, into the bosoms of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, into the place from whence pain, and sorrow, and sighing flyeth. And St. Chrysostom shews that the funeral Ordinances of the Church were appointed to admonish the living, that the Parties deceased were in a state of joy and not of grief; and therefore they sung at the Burial, Return my Soul to thy rest, for the Lord hath dealt bountifully with thee. And this he proves likewise from the Ancient Liturgies, wherein prayers are made for all Saints, Patriarchs, Prophets, Apostles, Martyrs, and others. And St. Ambrose, after he had said, That Valentinian and Gratian were both blessed, and enjoyed the pleasures of everlasting life; and yet subjoyns his Orizons for them. Thus he prays for Theodosius, of whom he had said, That he enjoys everlasting light, and continual tranquility: And so for his Brother Satyrus, when he had pronounced of him before, That he had entered into the Kingdom of Heaven. The same doth Gregory Nazianzen for his Brother Casarius. Now, Is it possible that you should think that Prayer for the Dead, as used in the Ancient Church, doth necessarily infer Purgatory; when they who made these Prayers, did suppose the Persons they made them for, to be at rest, and in joy, and in the Kingdom of Heaven? And I hope that is a different state from that of Purgatory. Therefore you see, it is not barely proved, that some different accounts are given of Prayer for the Dead, but such as are exclusive of it, and those such as appear from the eldest times of the Church, when such Prayers were used. Now, having thus shewed, for whom these Prayers were made, he proceeds to shew, of what kinds they were, whereof, he saith, some were Eucharistical for the blessed estate of the party deceased; others deprecatory, and petitory, that God would forgive him his sins, keep him from Hell, and place him in the Kingdom of Heaven: which, though at first well meant, were turned to an ill use afterwards, when these intercessions began once to be applied not only to the good, but evil livers also, unto whom by the first Institution they were never intended. And he at large proves by very many examples, that the primary Intention of the Church in her supplications for the Dead, was,

That

p. 204.

p. 224.

That the whole Man (not the Soul separated only) might receive publick remission of Sins, and a Solemn acquittal in the Judgment of the great Day, and so obtain both a full escape from all the consequences of Sin, and a perfect consummation of Bliss and Happiness. And of this nature he shews afterwards were the Prayers of the Church used in Epiphanius's time, which Acrius was condemned for rejecting of; and he plainly proves, that the Church of Rome comes nearer the Opinion of Acrius, than they would seem to do. For they agree with Acrius, in rejecting that kind of praying and offering for the Dead, which was used in the Church at that time; which was for such as were believed to be in Bliss. For, since the Romanists say, That without the supposition of Purgatory, Prayer for the Dead would be unprofitable, and at that time the Souls they prayed for, are supposed to be already in bliss; therefore they do as much condemn those Prayers for the Dead, which were then used, as Acrius did. And it is very strange, if the releasing of Souls out of Purgatory, had been any ground then of praying for the Dead, that Epiphanius, among all his far-fetcht Reasons, should never assign that, which you think to be the only proper ground of such Prayers. Thus we see, what was the general Intention of the Church in those Prayers which were made for the Dead, and how far this was from inferring Purgatory.

But besides this, there were several particular Opinions among the Ancient Fathers touching the place and condition of Souls separated from their Bodies: and according to the several Apprehensions which they had thereof, they made different interpretations and applications of the Use of praying for the Dead; whose particular intentions and devotions in that kind, must of necessity therefore be distinguished from the general intention of the whole Church. Thus there were two Opinions much in vogue among many of the Fathers, viz. of Souls being kept in secret receptacles till the day of Resurrection, and the purging of them in the Fire of conflagration at the day of Judgment; of which Opinion were not only S. Augustin, but Origen, Lactantius, S. Hilary, S. Ambrose, and others. Now according to these Opinions they interpreted the Use of praying for the Dead. And thence S. Augustin saith, That the Oblations and Alms usually offered in the Church for all the Dead that received Baptism, were Thanksgivings for such as were very good, Propitiations for such as were not very bad; but as for such as were very evil, although they were no helps of the Dead, yet were they some kind of consolations of the Living; but this was only a private exposition of the Church's meaning in her Prayers, because it is not to be found in the writings of the former Fathers; and, because it suiteth not well with the general practice of the Church, which it intendeth to interpret. For it is somewhat too harsh an interpretation, to imagine that one and the same act of praying, should be a petition for some, and for others only a Thanksgiving. Some other private Opinions there were besides these, as that of Theophylact, That God did not always cast grievous sinners into Hell, but that the Prayers of the Church might keep them from being cast into Hell; another, That an augmentation of Glory might be procured for the Saints, and either a total deliverance, or a diminution of torment at least, obtained for the wicked; to which S. Chrysostom and others incline. Besides, there were different Opinions concerning the benefit which the Dead received, by the Prayers of the Living. For the Author of the Questions and Answers in Justin Martyr's works, Gregory Nazianzen, Theodoret, Diodorus, Tarsensis, and S. Hierom, all conclude that there is no release to be expected for the Sins of those who were dead. But others supposed, the Dead might receive profit by the Prayers

of the Living, either for remission of their Sins, or the ceasing of their Punishment; but they were not agreed as to the nature of the Sins, which might be pardoned, or the manner of the benefit which they received, whether their punishment were only lessened, or at last extinguished. And Stephanus Gobius in Photius, tells us, That though some held these things, yet the true Sentence of the Church was, That none at all was freed from Punishment. But that still this was a Question in the Church, Whether the Dead received profit by the Prayers of the Living, that learned Author more at large proves, but my design is only to give a very brief extract of his Discourse, that you may from thence see, how false by the Intention of the Church in Praying for the Dead, you are from gathering the necessary belief of Purgatory.

§. 8.

p. 361.

Answ. p. 317

And by this a full Answer is given to what you object concerning the Practice of the Fathers, to pray for the Soul, and not the Body, and that when we pray for them, they receive Ease, Comfort, and Refreshment by our Prayers, and that they obtain Pardon, and Mercy, and Deliverance from pain for them, and that by the help of our Prayers they are brought to Eternal Rest and Happiness. But all this falls short of your purpose, unless you can prove that any of them either believed or prayed that any such Ease and Refreshment were obtained by the Prayers of the Living before the day of Resurrection. That they prayed, That God would have mercy upon them in that day, we deny not, which implies Ease, Comfort, Refreshment, Pardon, deliverance from Pain, and Eternal Happiness; but then all this refers not to any Purgatory-pains, which they had undergone before, but those eternal pains which their Sins deserved, if God should deal in justice with them. We grant then, that Supplications and Intercessions were used in the Church for the Dead, but we say, They did respect by the intention of the Church the day of Judgment, and God's final justification of them by his Sentence at that day. For the Scriptures (as my Lord Primate truly saith) every where do point out that great day to us, as the day wherein mercy and forgiveness, rest and refreshing, joy and gladness, Redemption and Salvation, Rewards and Crowns, shall be bestowed upon all God's Children, 2 Tim. 1. 16, 18. 1 Cor. 1. 8. Act. 3. 19. 2 Thes. 1. 6, 7. Phil. 2. 19. 1 Thes. 2. 16. 1 Pet. 1. 5. 1 Cor. 5. 5. Ephes. 4. 30. Luk. 21. 28. 2 Tim. 4. 8. Luk. 14. 14. From whence it is no improbable deduction, that even the Souls of good Men, do not enjoy their full and compleat felicity, till the great day: not that they either sleep or undergo any Purgatory-pains; but that they are at rest from their labours, and in a blessed condition, but still waiting with a solicitous expectation for the Glorious Coming of Christ, that they may then receive the reward prepared for them before the beginning of the World. But, Whether those Souls be in Heaven (as it notes a place, and not a state) whether the degrees of their Happiness be proportionable (till the great day) to the degrees of grace, which they had when they left the World, are Questions of more curiosity, than necessity to be resolved. But, as long as the Scripture doth insist so much on the proceedings of the great day, both as to rewards and punishments, we do not condemn the practice of the Ancient Church in those prayers which did thus respect the day of Resurrection. If any of the Fathers had any particular Opinions concerning the state of the Dead, and of the benefit which came to them by the Prayers of the Living; we are no more concerned to defend them, than you are to defend those whom you acknowledge to hold, that no Souls did enjoy the beatific vision before the day of Judgment, against whom Bellarmine and others dispute at large. Since you therefore confess yourselves, that some of the greatest of the Fathers did for many Ages hold erroneous Opinions concerning the state of the

the Dead, With what reason can you press us with the Testimonies of those whom you refuse yourselves? And since they had so many different Opinions concerning the state of Souls, it seems strange that none of them (at least till St. *Augustin's* time) should hit upon such a state of Purgation, whereby they might be freed from pains before the day of Judgment. And yet we find not one of them, which did so much as dream of that Purgatory which you call the upper Region of Hell; or of any punishment, which they who dyed in favour with God, should undergo between Death and Judgment, out of which they might be delivered by the Prayers of the Living. Many of them indeed supposed that Souls were kept in secret receptacles; but they were far from asserting that they underwent at all any pains equal to the damned, much less that any Souls were translated thence to Glory upon the intercessions made for them; others supposed that the Souls of all good Men were at last to pass thorow the Fire of conflagration at the day of Judgment; others, that the Souls of wicked Men might either escape, or have their torments mitigated; but all this while your Purgatory was unthought of, and was not conceived till afterwards, through the ignorance and Superstition of some, countenanced by pretended apparitions and visions of Souls departed, till at last it grew to be one of the favourite Opinions of the Roman Church. From whence it may easily appear, how very much you were deceived, when you would infer, because Prayer for the Dead, as it is now used in the Roman Church, doth necessarily suppose Purgatory; therefore it must do so in the Ancient Church: for, altho' we should grant the same Prayers to be still used, yet since they are used for a quite different intent, that may be suppos'd by you, which was not at all suppos'd by them, nor could be infer'd from what they did. And yet it is plain, that in some cases, you have changed the Prayers for the Saints, into Prayers to them: For, whereas in the old Gregorian Sacramentary, it was, *Grant unto us, O Lord, that this oblation may profit the Soul of thy Servant Leo*; in the latter Books it is turned into this, *Grant unto us, O Lord, that by the intercession of thy Servant Leo, this oblation may profit us*. From whence you may see, that your Prayers are changed from what they were: For the Ancient Church prayed universally for all Saints and Martyrs; but you think it a disparagement to them to pray for them and therefore from your kind of Prayers for the Dead, we may well say, that Purgatory is supposed; but we cannot possibly infer it from those Prayers which were made for such, who, if any, were supposed in a state of Bliss and Happiness.

And that the intention of your Church is quite different from the Ancient, we now come more fully to make manifest; because none of them did believe that Doctrine of Purgatory, which you assert. But herein we must follow your footsteps, and consider the many Authorities which you produce out of Bullarmin, and undertake to vindicate in behalf of Purgatory; to which I give this general Answer, That some Authors are counterfeit, and the places suppositions; of those that are true, some speak only of Commemoration of the Dead, and Oblations made for them; others respect the day of Resurrection, and the Fire of Conflagration, others the Purging of the wicked, others only of a purgation in this life; but none of them all speak of any Purgatory-pains of those who dye in favour with God, which they undergo as the temporal punishment of sin, from whence they may be delivered by the Prayers of the Living; which is the only thing you should prove from them. And this I come to make appear by the examination of the particulars, as they occur in order.

Answer to
the Jesuit,
p. 210.

§. 9.

The

P. 361.

De confirm.
l. 2. c. 7.Dionys. Areop.
de Eccles. Hier.
cap. 7.De Coron. Mi-
li. c. 3.
De Monog.
c. 10.C. Mart. l. 4.
c. 34.De animâ
c. 34.Iren. l. 5. cap.
25.

The first you begin with, is, *Dionysius Areopagita*; and, Is not he, say you, an Author of the first three hundred years? As though this had never been questioned by any? If you had asked, Whether he had been an Ancient and Learned Author, living sometime within the first four hundred years; you should not have met with any opposition from me. But if you would needs have him to be the true *Dionysius*, you must prove it better than by meer referring us to what *Bellarmino*, *Baronius*, and *Del-Rio* have said upon that Subject; and you were very strangely deceived when you say, That only *Erasmus*, and *Valla*, and some few others, did doubt of it; but at present you suppose few Learned Men doubt of the matter. For, even *Bellarmin* himself doubts of it; and, What think you of *Hibertus*, *Sirmondus*, *Launæus*, *Petavius*? Are not all these with you learned Men, who have all declared their doubts of it? and so will any one else do, that impartially examines the Arguments brought on both sides. But we have no reason to insist longer upon this, since you say, It is sufficient, that he is acknowledged for a Writer of great Antiquity; Well, But what is it then this Author saith? only that Prayers were made for the deceased party, that God would forgive his Sins, and place him in the Light and Countrey of the Living: But, say you, both the Archbishop and Primate would have thought that Man a Papist, who would have made the like prayer for his deceased Friend in their hearing. And very good reason they might have to think so, when they know beforehand that your intention of praying for the Dead, is, to deliver their Souls from the pains of Purgatory; but, if they had heard one use such a Prayer in the Ancient Church, they could not have imagined, it was for any such intention, since the same Person in *Dionysius* is said to be replenished with Divine Joy, and not fearing any change to the worse, but knowing well that the good things possessed, shall be firmly and everlastingly enjoyed; as he speaks at his entrance upon that Discourse: And, if this be in effect to teach Purgatory, as you would have it, you must set your Purgatory a great deal higher than you do; for, you say, It is but an upper Region of Hell, a little after, when *Dionysius* speaks of those who were in a Region of rest and Happiness.

Your second Author is *Tertullian*; and three Citations you produce out of him. In the first, he only mentions the Oblations for the Dead, which we have confessed to be used already, but without any respect to Purgatory. In the second, a mention is made of begging of God *refrigerium*, refreshment for the Soul of one departed: this were something to the purpose, if you had first proved, that *Tertullian* did suppose that Soul to be then in the pains of Purgatory; for then it were but reason to think this *refrigerium* did relate to the easing of them. But he elsewhere tells us, what he means by this *refrigerium*, *Sinus Abrahæ interim refrigerium præbiturus est animabus justorum*, by which he understands not any deliverance from pains, but contentment in expectation of the future Resurrection. It was the ardency of the desire after that which made them pray for this *refrigerium*, not out of any punishment they were supposed to be under for Sin, but their earnest expectation of future glory. And, since they supposed different degrees of refreshment which the Souls had in the bosom of Abraham, this prayer only notes the desire of the continuance and increase of it, and not being under present pains for the want of it.

In the last place of *Tertullian*, you would fain have the Carcer infernus to be Purgatory, but he means no more by it than Hades, or the common receptacle of Souls till the day of Resurrection, which *Irenæus* calls *locum invivibilem*, which renders *adns* exactly, in which he makes Souls to stay till the

day

day of Resurrection; and Tertullian explains himself afterwards, when he says, *Constituimus omnem animam apud Inferos sequestrari in diem Domini*; and therefore Bellarmine confesses Tertullian to be one of those, that held that no Souls did enjoy the beatifical vision, till the day of Resurrection; at which time he supposed the order of rising, to be according to the degrees of holiness; and therefore he makes the punishment of Souls not to be any Purgatory pains, but the *mora resurrectionis*, that they should be longer before they rise from the dead, viz. towards the latter end of the thousand years; for so he makes the Resurrection to continue the thousand years of Christ's Reign upon earth; and, as the highest rank of Christians should rise in the beginning of it, so others in their order according to their degrees, and the most slothful and negligent to be punished *mora resurrectionis*, by their Resurrection being deferred to the conclusion of it. By which we may fully understand Tertullian's meaning, *Judex in carcerem te mandet infernum, unde non dimittaris, nisi modico quoque delicto mora resurrectionis expenso*; by which lower Prison he intends neither Hell nor Purgatory, but the common receptacle of Souls, wherein they were held till they should rise sooner or latter according to the measure of their graces and sins.

De An. cap. 55.

The next place to be examined, is the noted one of St. Cyprian, to Antonianus: where he gives an account of the difference between the lapsed Persons who become penitents, and the Martyrs. *Aliud est adveniam stare, aliud ad gloriam pervenire; aliud missum in carcerem non exire inde, donec solvat novissimum quadrantem; aliud statim fidei & virtutis mercedem accipere; aliud pro peccatis longo dolore emendari, & purgari diu igne, aliud peccata omnia passione purgasse.* It is one thing to stay in hope and expectation of pardon, another thing to come presently to glory; 'tis one thing to be cast into prison, and not to come out thence, till you have paid the last farthing; another to receive presently the reward of our Faith: 'tis one thing to be amended for sins by long grief, and to be purged with fire a great while; another to have purged away all his sins by suffering Martyrdom. Did not S. Cyprian, say you, think of Purgatory, when he taught this? No, that did he not, if we believe your own Writers. For Rigaltius tells us, that S. Cyprian here speaks of the severities of Penance, which the lapsed Persons underwent in order to pardon; and compares them with the present felicity which Martyrs were possessed of. And this was that purging fire in order to their amendment, which he insists on, to shew what great disparity there was between the state of these Penitents, and the Martyrs; thereby to shew, that though Penitents were admitted by the Church, yet it was with so much severity, that might give little encouragement for Men to fall in hopes of admission. For that was the main thing which S. Cyprian there discoursed of. And thus likewise Albaspinaus understands it, of such who suffered penance all their Life-time, and were absolved only at the point of Death; these were they who were held in prison till they paid the utmost farthing. Neither may it seem strange that this should be called a purging fire; since S. Hierom describing, the penance of Fabiola, saith, *Sedit super carbones ignis*, She sate upon coals of fire; and Pope Siricius in his Epistle to Himerius extant in the Councils, calls, perpetual penance, *purificatorium paenitudinis ignem*, the purging fire of penance. And this seems a great deal more probable to be S. Cyprian's meaning, because he speaks most clearly of any of the Fathers of the immediate Happiness of all God's Children after death, in his excellent Book of mortality; wherein he comforts the Christians of Carthage against the fears of death, by Reason of the raging plague,

§. 10.

Rigalt. observ. ad Cyp. 68.

Albaspin. observ. l. 2. c. 12

Hierom. ep. Fab. ad Ocean.

plague, which was then among them. *It is for him, saith he, to fear death, that would not go to Christ; it is for him not to be willing to go to Christ, that doth not believe he shall begin to reign with him;* with much more to the same purpose throughout that Book, which, I pray read, and then tell me, Whether St. Cyprian did think of Purgatory or no.

§. 11.

P. 363.

De Purgat. l. 2.
c. 1.Biblioth. l. 5.
Annot. 170.Sixtus Sen.
Biblioth. l. 5.
Annot. 171.Comment. in
Isa. 66. ad fin.

I wonder with what face you produce Origen's Testimony in behalf of your Doctrine of Purgatory, since Bellarmine confesses that he held all punishment to be only Purgatory; and that this Opinion of his was condemned in the fifth Oecumenical Council. But, you say, in the place produced by you, he saith no such thing, but that Men are purged according to the mixture of Lead and Gold in them, but that those who have all Lead, shall sink down to the bottomless pit for ever. Than which (you say) nothing can be spoken more clearly for Purgatory. To which a short Answer shall serve by this Dilemma; either you have faithfully represented this place of Origen, or not: If you have, it is plain that Origen hath been infinitely abused, or else apparently contradicts himself; for you make him here plainly to assert the eternity of punishment, which the fifth General Council according to you infallibly condemned him for denying; if you have unfaithfully represented him, then still Origen cannot be understood of such a Purgatory as you speak of, but of such a one which all must pass thorow, good and bad; and their continuance in it, is according to the proportions of good or evil in them. And of such a Purgatory as this, Bellarmine confesses that Origen speaks: and which he places after the Resurrection, and saith, That even Peter and Paul must pass thorow it. And for such Purgatory as this is, many places are produced out of Origen, by Sixtus Senensis, and many others. But this is an universal Purgatory for good and bad, after the Resurrection, and for the Body as well as the Soul; and judge you now, Whether this be the Purgatory you contend for or no. The following Testimonies of St. Ambrose, Hilary, Lactantius, St. Hierom, &c. are taken off by Bellarmine himself; since, although in his first Book he produceth them for the Roman Doctrine of Purgatory, yet in the beginning of the Second he confesseth, that all these were for such an Universal Purgatory at the day of Judgment, thorow which all must pass, not the Virgin Mary her self excepted. And St. Hierom, though he denies Origen's Hypothesis as to the final Salvation of all, yet seems by the places you cite out of him, very willing to admit of it, as to all such who dye in the Churches Communion; against which Opinion St. Augustin at large disputes, as I have shewed already. I acknowledge then that these Authors do speak of a purging fire, but such a one as yourselves disown and dispute against, and Bellarmine could no other wayes bring any of them off, but by saying, That they speak of the fire of the last Judgment; by which we see the apparent Sophistry, in bringing those as plain places for your Purgatory, which you confess yourselves, are understood of something else. It being confessed that they speak of purging, consequent to the Resurrection, which is quite another thing from what you plead for. And besides, it is plain from St. Hierom's words, that he speaks of wicked Men dying in the Communion of the Church, that they shall at last be saved. And if you will needs have arbitramur, when it is opposed to credimus, to signifie a firm belief, (which is another proof of your skill in Lexicons) that which you can only infer thence, is, that S. Hierom did, as firmly believe that wicked Men (if Christians) should at last be saved, as that Devils, and Atheists, and other wicked Men should be finally damned. For these are his words; *Et sicut Diaboli & omnium negatorum, atque impiorum qui dixerunt in corde suo,*

suo, non est Deus, credimus aterna tormenta; sic peccatorum atq; impiorum, & tamen Christianorum, quorum opera in igne probanda sunt atq; purganda, moderatam arbitramur, & mixtam dementia sententiam Judicis. And the same he rather more fully asserts in the other place, *& Christianos, si in peccato praeveniti fuerint, salvandos esse post pœnas;* but you who are never backward in helping the Fathers to speak out, very commodiously render it, *Such as dye before full and perfect Penance for the sins, of which they had truly repented:* Which is far from Purgatory as from St. Hierom's meaning, for he doth not oppose penitent Sinners to impenitent, but opposes wicked Men dying in the Church's Communion, to the Devil and his Angels, and all other wicked Persons, *All which (he saith) shall perish eternally, but such as are Christians should be saved at last after undergoing punishment.* And it is to be observed, that at the end of the Commentaries on Isaiah, he immediately before speaks of that which is supposed to be the Origenical Hypothesis, viz. *That the Torments of the other Life shall after a long time be ended;* and when he hath produced the places of Scripture which the favourers of it did produce, he only passes this censure of it, *Quod nos Dei solius scientia debemus derelinquere;* Which we ought to leave to the Knowledge of God alone; and then concludes with that moderation of his sentence, *That he did believe the Eternity of Torments of Devils, Atheists, &c. but of such who were Christians he did suppose God would mingle Mercy with his Justice, and that after they had been sufficiently purged by Fire they might escape at last.* If he had intended only a mitigation of their Torments who were Christians, the opposition could not lye as it doth between the Eternity of some, and the Clemency of God in others, but the Eternity must have been confessed in both, and the opposition made only in the weight of the Torments of such who were not Christians above such as were. If St. Hierom doth (as Bellarmine contends) elsewhere contradict this, by so much the less is his Testimony of any validity in this Case, it being plain what his meaning is here; but that seems the less probable, because he writ his Books against the Pelagians in which he asserts the same, not long before his death. This Purging-fire then, of St. Hierom makes little for your purpose, since it is only a more refined branch of Origen's Hypothesis, and is understood of a fire after the Resurrection, and that of Hell, and not of Purgatory, and wherein wicked Men shall be purged if they dyed in the Church's Communion, and not such who repented of their Sins in this life. But if St. Hierom himself do not speak to the purpose, you hope one under his name may do it (and we must needs say Purgatory hath been always beholding to forgeries) for you cite his Commentaries on the Proverbs, which are rejected as counterfeit by Sixtus Senensis, Canus, Marianus Victorius, and Bellarmine himself.

But from St. Hierome we proceed to St. Basil, who, you say, teaches the same Doctrine with him; if he doth, it is very little for your comfort. But so far was St. Basil from asserting your Doctrine, that although he speaks of a purging-fire, he speaks not at all concerning it in another Life, but only of that which purgeth out Sins in the Souls of Men in this life. For he calls the Spirit of God working upon Mens Souls, that *πῦρ καὶ ἀσίνη*, which consumes Sin within them; as may be seen by comparing his Commentaries on the sixth and the ninth of Isaiah together. And where he afterwards speaks not of an utter rejection, but an expurgation as by Fire; it is plain that he understands it of the Fire of affliction in this life, and not the Fire of Purgatory in another. But wherever you meet with Fire and purging, you think it impossible to be understood of any thing but your Purgatory; it seems you are hugely pos-

Con. Pelag.
l. 1.

§. 12.
P. 365.

Comment. in
Isa. 9.

Sixtus Sen. l.
5. Annot. 171.
Esius in
1 Cor. 3.
Nazian.
orat. 39.

orat. 26.
In Psal. 118.

P. 367.

Biblioth. God.
333.

§. 13.
P. 368.

fed with the fears of it, that you think you meet with it, wherever you go. But if you will needs have St. Basil to speak of a future state, then your own *Sixtus Senensis*, and *Esius* will tell you that he is to be understood of the Fire of Conflagration at the Day of Judgement; of which he speaks in several other places. And so *Nicas* understands the place of *Gregory Nazianzen* which you produce about Baptism by Fire, for saith he, *Per ignis baptismum, examen censuramque divini judicii intelligit*, and for that cites the place of the Apostle, *Every Man's work shall be tried by Fire*. This he calls elsewhere the last fire by which our works shall be judged and purged. And of this *Lactantius* and *Hilary* are to be understood: for *Hilary* expressly saith, *That even the Virgin Mary shall pass through it*, whom I hope you will not place in Purgatory. The Testimony of *Batius* shall then be taken, when you prove that he doth not speak in the Person of a Philosopher, but of a Christian, delivering Matters of Faith with an *ut puto*; but if you had considered the design of his Book, for the sake of Philosophy, you might have spared his citation. And so you might for your own sake that of *Theodoret*, which not only the Greeks in their *Apology* cry out on as counterfeit; both no such place, as yet appears in any edition of *Theodoret*. And the same Greeks tell you, if you consulted the honour of *Gregory Nyssen* you would spare him too, because he was a favourer of the *Origenical Hypothesis* concerning the redintegration of all things; and so many places are produced out of him wherein he makes the nature of all pains to be Purgatory, that the Patriarch *Germanus* (of whom *Photius* speaks) had no other way to vindicate him, but by saying that the *Origenists* had foisted many places into his works. If you would therefore say, *That it is a groundless calumny, to say that any of the Fathers did corrupt the Christian Doctrine by the opinions of Plato*; you must either deny that *Origen* and his followers ever asserted any Doctrine contrary to Christianity, and therein contradict the fifth *Oecumenical Council*; or that any of the Fathers had any touch of *Origen's* opinion: both which I suppose are tasks you will be unwilling to undertake. But whether their opinions are true or false (which we are not now enquiring after) to be sure they are far enough from your Doctrine of Purgatory, which supposeth the Sin pardoned in this life, and yet the Punishment undergone for it in another: which Doctrine if it were granted at all reasonable, it would be much more, asserting it to be after the Resurrection, when the Body might endure Pains as well as the Soul, than so absurdly as you make the Soul only to suffer, and that too in a way the most unlike of all other, viz. by a material fire.

But it is time we come to the succour of St. *Augustin*, who it seems hath his share of Purgatory in this life; for, you say, *He hath the ill hap to be used the worst of all other*. Because his Lordship represents him as dubious and uncertain (as no doubt he was) in this point: which argues indeed that he was a Novice in your Roman Faith, but thereby the more a Father of the Church. But you are the Man, that, let St. *Augustin* say what he will himself, will prove to his face, that he could not possibly be thought to deny or doubt of Purgatory. And it is a Combat worth seeing, to see you dispute against St. *Augustin*; but you do it so pitifully, that St. *Augustin* remains as uncertain as ever he was. The only place which seems to the purpose, *Constat animas purgari post hanc vitam*, &c. is so notorious a counterfeit, that not only *Vives* confesses no such words appeared in the Ancient Copies; but they are wholly left out, not only in the *Basil Edition*, 1556. but in that of *Lyons* 1560. and in the latter *Louvain* and *Paris Editions*, The other places, you confess yourself, relate to the benefit which the

the Dead receive by the Prayers of the Living, of which a large Account hath been already given without any supposition of *Purgatory*. Whether *St. Austin's* doubts did refer only to the Circumstances of *Purgatory*, and not to the thing itself, I leave it to the Consideration of any reasonable Man, who will read the places already cited, wherein those Doubts are expressed. By which one may see at what rate you use your Expressions, when you can have the face to say, *That S. Austin no less constantly teaches the Doctrine of Purgatory, than he doth the Doctrine of Heaven and Hell.* Which after the language of the *Sorborn-Censures*, is a false, rash, and scandalous assertion, and as ungrounded as *Purgatory* itself. The remaining Testimonies of *St. Cyril* and *St. Chrysostom*, only speak of Prayer for the Dead, and the Benefit of that, and so offers nothing new to our Consideration. But at last we are come to a Man who did in good earnest believe *Purgatory*, and was the first of any Name in the Church who did so, and that is *Gregory I.* But whosoever reads in his *Dialogues* the excellent Arguments he builds it on, and confirms it with, will find as much Reason to pity his Superstition and credulity, as to condemn his Doctrine. And after this time, his Lordship saith truly, *Purgatory was found to warm a business to be suffer'd to cool again; and in the after-Ages more were frightened, then led by proof into the belief of it.* And although amidst the variety of Judgments among the Fathers concerning the state of the Dead, not one of them affirmed your Doctrine of *Purgatory*, before *Gregory I.*; yet by all means you will needs have it to have been still owned as an *Apostolical Tradition*, and an *Article of Faith*. But I commend you, that knowing the weakness of the Arguments brought from the *Fathers* and *Scripture*, you at last take Sanctuary in the Church's definition; on the Account of which you say, *We are as much bound to believe it as any other Article of Faith, yea, as the Trinity or Incarnation itself.* But this holds for none, but only those who so little understand the grounds of their Religion as to believe it on the account of your Church's Infallibility; which is so far from being any ground of Faith, that if we had nothing more certain than that, to establish our Faith upon, you would be so far from making Men believe *Purgatory* on that account, that you would sooner make them Question, whether there were either *Heaven* or *Hell*. But though your Church be so far from Infallibility that we have found her guilty of many Errors, yet the Word of God abideth for ever, which alone is the sure Foundation for our Faith to rest upon. And so I conclude with your own Prayer: *I beseech God to give all Men light to see this Truth, and Grace to assent unto it; to the end, that by living in the Militant Church in the Unity of Faith, we may come at last to meet in Glory in the Triumphant Church of Heaven, which we may hope for by the merits of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, To whom with the Father, and the Holy Ghost, be all honour and glory world without end.*

P. 372.

C.

A REPLY to Mr. J. Serjeant's Third Appendix, Containing some Animadversions on the Book, Intituled, A Rational Account of the Ground of the Protestant Religion.

To his honoured Friend Dr. Tillotson.

S I R,

§. 1.

AS soon as I understood your Intentions to answer Mr. Serjeant, I could not but rejoyce on his behalf, as well as on the Truth's and your own. For I have that real kindness for him, that I heartily wish him that Reason and Science he pretends to; which I could not but despair of his attaining, unless he were undeceived in that monstrous opinion he hath of himself and his undertakings. And I knew no Person more fit than you, to let him understand the truth and himself together. In which, your Performances have been so clear and satisfactory, that I hope Mr. Serjeant, instead of another Letter of directions to his Answerer, will write you one of thanks, for the reason and kindness you have shewed him throughout your Book. Unless it fares with you, as it hath done with some other *Adversaries* of theirs, that their civility hath been interpreted as an Argument of their uncertainty, and their own confidence cry'd up for a demonstration. In which sense only I shall grant our Protestant Writers to build on uncertainties, and Mr. White and Mr. Serjeant to be the great *Demonstrators* of this Age. If their own reason had been as severe as the censures at Rome against them, they had saved us the labour of any answer, and would have found out their own *sophistry* without a confutation. But the least thing we can imagine by their excessive confidence, is, that they are deceived themselves; and therefore it is a part of charity to them, as well as justice to the Truth, to let the World see, that big words are quite another thing from Science, and a strong presumption from a regular demonstration. As to which, no more need to have been said, than what you have already done, if Mr. Serjeant had not thought it an accession to the glory of his achievements, to lead two Pages of my Book in triumph after him. I confess, I was somewhat surprized to see a Person who would be noted for his valour in assaulting Protestant Writers, steal so behind the main bulk and design of my Book; and when he had gotten two single Pages by themselves, fall upon them with as much pomp and ostentation, as if he had attack'd the whole. And this must be noised abroad as an Answer to me, by the same figure that his Arguments are called demonstrations, which is by an *hyperbole* unfit for any, but such who never flag below the spear of Science in their own Judgments, though they seem not to come near it in others. Yet since Mr. Serjeant is not only pleased to concern himself so far as to Answer that part of my Book relating to Oral Tradition; but in most express terms to

challenge

challenge me to reply to him, he may, now see (as soon as I could get any Liberty from greater Employments) how ready I am to give him all reasonable Satisfaction. And in the first place, I return him thanks for the weapon he hath made choice of, *viz.* that of *Reason*: there being no other I desire to make use of, in managing this debate between us: And I hope he will find as much civility towards him throughout this discourse as he expresses towards me in the entrance to his, if that may be accounted any real civility, which is intended, merely out of design, with the greater advantage to disparage the cause I have undertaken, and yet see no reason to repent of. *If in his cursory view of two Chapters of my Book he had (as he saith) quite lost me, he had no Cause to be troubled for it, if he had found far more excellent Persons, such as Dr. Hammond, and the Dissuader, and Dr. Pierce, instead of me. But to be sure, he intends not this in honour to any of us, but by a way of a common reproach to us all, as though we did not talk out of nature or things, but words and imagination.* I could heartily have wished, Mr. S. would have *cropt so much of the victory due to another's Learning and Industry, as to have shewed me one proposition in those Discourses, which a rational understanding, that would be true to itself, could not settle or rely on.* But if such insinuations as these must pass for answers, I must needs say, I judge Mr. S. equally happy in confuting our grounds, and in demonstrating his own; in both which, his greatest strength lies in the *self-evidence* of his bare affirmations. But it seems he is willing to resign the glory of this *Victory* to the *judicious Author of Labyrinthus Cantuariensis*, or to some others for him; and when they have once obtained it, shall not envy them the honour of it. And I suppose those Persons, whoever they are, may be able by this time, to tell Mr. S. it is an easier matter to talk of *Victories* than to get them. But if they do no more in the whole, than Mr. S. hath done for his share, they will triumph no-where, but where they conquer, *viz.* in their own fancies and imaginations. Therefore leaving them to their silent conquests, and as yet, unheard-of *Victories*, we come to Mr. S. who so liberally proclaims his own in the point of oral tradition. *Which (in a phrase scarce heard of in our Language before) is the Post, he tells us, he hath taken upon him to explicate farther and defend.* What the *explicating a Post* means, I as little understand, as I do the force of his demonstrations; but this, and many other such uncouth forms of speech, up and down in his Book (which make his style so smooth and easie,) are I suppose intended for embellishments of our Tongue, and as helps to *sure-speaking*, as his whole Book is designed for *sure-footing*.

But leting him enjoy the pleasure and felicity of his own expressions, I come to consider the matter in debate between us. And his first controversy with me, is, *for opposing the Infallibility of Oral Tradition, to Doctrinal Infallibility in Pope and Councils.* A Controversie fitter to be debated among themselves, than between him and me: For is any thing more notorious, than that *Infallibility* is by the far greatest part of *Romanists* attributed to the present Church, in teaching and delivering matters of Faith, not by virtue of any Oral Tradition, but the immediate assistance of the *Holy Ghost*; and that this is made by them the only ground of Divine Faith; For which Mr. S. may if he please, consult his *judicious Author of Labyrinthus Cantuariensis*, or any other of their present Writers, except Mr. White and himself. He need not therefore have been to seek for the meaning of this doctrinal Infallibility, as opposed to Traditionary, if he had not either been ignorant of the opinion of their own Writers, or notoriously

P. 202

§. 2.

P. 203

notoriously dissembled it. For this Infallibility is not attributed to the Rulers of the Church, meerly as *Doctors* or *Scholars*, but as the representative Church, whose Office it is, to deliver all Matters of Faith by way of an infallible Testimony to every Age, and thereby to afford a sufficient foundation for Divine Faith. But Mr. S. attributes no such Infallibility to the representative Church, as teaching the rest, but derives their Infallibility from such grounds as are common to all parts of the essential Church. Wherein he apparently opposes himself to the whole current of their own Authors, who resolve all Faith into the immediate assistance of the Holy Ghost; without which, they assert, there could be no Infallibility at all in Tradition, or anything else; and therefore these Opinions are as opposite to each other as may be. For such an Infallibility is not attributed by them to the Teachers of the Church, merely on some signal occasions, as Mr. S. seems to suppose, when they are to explain new Matters of Faith; but it is made by them to be as necessary as believing itself, because thereby the only sure foundation of Faith is laid; and therefore it is very evident, they make it proper to the Church in all Ages: Or else in some Age of the Church Men were destitute of sufficient grounds of Faith. For they by no means think it a sufficient foundation of Faith, that one Age of the Church could not conspire to deceive another; for this they will tell him, at most, is but a humane Faith: but that Christ by his Promise hath assured the Church, that there shall never be wanting in it the infallible assistance of his Holy Spirit, whereby they shall infallibly teach and deliver all Matters of Faith. And if this be not their Opinion, let them speak to the contrary, which if they do, I am sure they must retract their most elaborate Discourses about resolution of Faith, written by the greatest Artists among them. Let Mr. S. then judge, who it is that stumbles at the Threshold; but of this difference among them, more afterwards. By this it appears, it was not any mistake that I remained unsatisfied with the Question I asked, *Whether I am bound to believe what the present Church delivers to be infallible?* To which Mr. S. answers, *I understand him not.* My reply shall be only that of a great Lawyer's in a like Case, *I cannot help that.* I am sure my words are intelligible enough; for I take *infallible* there as he takes it himself, for *infallibly true*; although I deny not the Word to be improperly used in reference to things; and that for the reason given by him, *because fallibility and infallibility belong to the knowing Power, or the Persons that have it, and not to the Object.* But we are often put to the use of that Word in a sense we acknowledge improper merely in compliance with our Adversaries, who otherwise are apt to charge us with having only uncertainties and probabilities for our Faith; if we do not use the term *infallible* applied to the truth of the thing. I am content therefore wherever, in what I have writ, he meets that term so apply'd, that he take it only in his own sense, for that which is *certainly true*; for I mean no more by it. And in this sense Mr. S. answers affirmatively, and gives this account of it, *not only because the present Church cannot be deceived in what the Church of the former Age believed, but because the Church in no Age could conspire against her knowledge to deceive that Age immediately following in Matter of Fact, evident in a manner to the whole World.* The Question then is, Whether this be a sufficient account for me to believe that to be certainly true, or to be the Doctrine of Christ and his Apostles, which the present Church delivers? and consequently, whether the resolution of Faith be barely into Oral Tradition?

E. 204.

§. 3.

Thus we see the clear state of the Question between us. I come therefore

fore to the vindication of those things which I had objected against this way of resolving Faith into Oral Tradition. Three things I especially insisted on. 1. That it is inconsistent with the pretensions of the present Roman Church. 2. That it hath not been the way owned in all Ages of the Christian Church. 3. That it is repugnant to common sense and experience, and that the Church of Rome hath apparently altered from what was the belief of former Ages. If these three be made good, there will be no cause to glory in this last invention, to support the sinking fabrick of that Church. These three then I undertake to defend against what Mr. Serjeant hath objected against them.

1. That it is contrary to the pretensions of the present Roman Church. And if it be so, there can be no reason for those who are of it, to rely upon it. For if so be that Church pretends, that the obligation to Faith arises from a quite different ground from this, how can they who believe that Church infallible, venture their Faith upon any other principle than what is publickly owned by her? And whosoever thinks himself bound to believe by virtue of an infallible assistance of the present Church doth thereby shew, that this obligation doth not depend upon what was delivered by the former Ages of the Church. As those who believed the Apostles were infallible in their Doctrine, could not resolve their Faith into the infallibility of Oral Tradition, but into that immediate assistance by which the Apostles spoke; and where there is a belief of a like assistance, the Foundation of Faith cannot lye in the Indefectibility of Tradition, but in that infallible Spirit which they suppose the Church to be assisted by. For supposing this oral tradition should fail, and that Men might believe that it had actually failed; yet if the former supposition were true, there was sufficient ground for Faith remaining still. And what assurance can any one have, that the present Church delivers nothing for matter of Faith, but what hath been derived in every Age from Christ and his Apostles, if such an infallible Spirit be supposed in the present Church which was in the Apostles themselves? For on the same reason that those who heard the Apostles were not bound to trouble themselves with the tradition of the former Age; no more ought they who believe the present Roman Church to have the same infallible assistance. They need not then enquire, Whether this Age knew the meaning of the former, or whether one Age could conspire to deceive another, or whether notwithstanding both these, errors might not come into the Church; it is sufficient for them, that the definitions of the present Church are infallible in all matters of Faith. Therefore my demand was built on very good reason; *How can ye assure me the present Church obliges me to believe nothing but only what, and so far as it received from the former Church?* And Mr. S's answer is far from being satisfactory, *That this appears by her manifest practice, never refusing communion to any Man, that could approve himself to believe all the former Age did.* For this may be resolved into a principle far different from this, which is the belief of the infallibility of the present Church. For supposing, that they are not bound to enquire themselves into the reasons why the Tradition could not fail in any Age; it is sufficient for them to believe the Church infallible; and if it be so, in proposing matters of Faith it must be so in declaring what the belief of the former Age was. But my demands go on, *What evidence can you bring to convince me both that the Church always observed this Rule, and could never be deceived in it?* Which question is built on these two Principles which the Infallibility of Oral Tradition

Tradition stands on : 1. That the Church must always go upon this ground. 2. That if it did so, it is impossible she should be deceived. Both which are so far from that *self-evidence* with Mr. Serjeant still pretends to in this way, that the *Jesuits* principles seem much more rational and consistent, than these do. For granting them but that one *Postulatum*, that there must be an inherent Infallibility in the Testimony of the present Church, to afford sufficient foundation for Divine Faith, all the rest of their doctrine follows naturally from it. Whereas this new way of resolving Faith is built on such suppositions, which no Man well in his wits will be ready to grant. For unless it be *self-evident* that the Church did always proceed on this ground, it cannot be *self-evident* that Oral Tradition is Infallible; because the *self-evidence* of this Principle depends on this, that in all Ages of the Church the only rule and measure of Faith, was what was delivered by Oral Tradition from the Age foregoing. Now if it be possible, that Matters of Faith might be conveyed in ways quite different from this, what *self-evidence* can there be, that the Church must always proceed upon this? Mr. S. then, must demonstrate it impossible for Matters of Faith to be conveyed to Posterity in any other way than Oral Tradition; and not only that the thing is impossible, but that the Church in all Ages Judged it to be so; or else he can never make it at all evident, that the Church always made this her rule of Faith. But if either there may be a certain conveyance of Doctrine of Faith another way, *viz.* by writing, or that the Church might Judge that way more certain, whether it were so or not, either way it will appear far enough from *self-evidence*, that she always Judged of Doctrines of Faith, merely by the Tradition of the preceeding Age. If another way be granted possible, there must be clear demonstration, that the Church notwithstanding this, did never make use of it; for if it did make use of another way of resolving Faith in any Age of the Church, then in that Age of the Church Oral Tradition was not looked on as the ground of Faith; and if so, notwithstanding whatever Mr. S. can demonstrate to the contrary, that Age might have believed otherwise than the immediately preceeding did. For let us but suppose, that all necessary Doctrines of Faith were betimes recorded in the Church in Books universally received by the Christians of the first Ages; is it not possible, that Age which first embraced these Books, might deliver them to Posterity as the rule of their Faith, and so down from one Age to another; and doth it not hence follow, that the Rule of Faith is quite different from a mere Oral Tradition? Let Mr. S. then either shew it impossible, that the Doctrines of Faith should be written; or that being written, they should be universally received; or that being universally received in one Age, they should not be delivered to the next; or being delivered to the next, those Books should not be looked on as containing the rule of Faith in them; or though they were so, yet, that still Oral Tradition was wholly relied on as the Rule of Faith; and then I shall freely grant that Mr. S. hath attempted something toward the proof of this new *hypothesis*. But as things now stand, it is so far from being *self-evident*, that the Church hath always gone upon this Principle, that we find it looked on as a great novelty among them in their own Church; and it would be a rare thing, for a new invention to have been the sense of the Church in all Ages; which if it hath been, the strength of it is thereby taken away.

§. 4.

But let us suppose, that the Church did proceed upon this principle, *that nothing was to be embraced, but what was derived by Tradition from the Apostles*; how

how doth it thence follow, that nothing could be admitted into the Church but what was really so derived from them? Do we not see in the World at this day, that among those who own this Principle, contradictory propositions are believed; and both sides tell us, It is on this account, because their Doctrine was delivered by the *Apostles*? doth not the *Greek Church*, profess to believe on the account of Tradition from the *Apostles* as well as the *Latin*? If that Tradition failed in the *Greek Church*, which was preserved in the *Latin*, either Mr. S. must instance on his own principles in that Age which conspired to deceive the next, or he must acknowledge, that while Men own Tradition they may be deceived in what the foregoing Age taught them; and consequently those things may be admitted as Doctrines coming from the *Apostles* which were not so, and some which did may be lost, and yet the pretence of Tradition remain still. What *self-evidence* then can there be in this Principle, when two parts of the Church may both own it, and yet believe Contradictions on the account of it; It is then worth our enquiring, what *self-evidence* this is which Mr. S. speaks so much of, which is neither more nor less, but that Men in all Ages had Eyes, Ears, and other Senses, also common Reason, and as much Memory as to remember their own names and frequently inculcated actions. Which is so very reasonable a *postulatum*, that I suppose none who enjoy any of these will deny it. Let us therefore see how he proceeds upon it. If you disprove this, I doubt we have lost Mankind, the subject we speak of; and till you disprove it, neither I, nor any Man in his wits can doubt, that this rule depending on testifying, that is, Sense or Experience, can possibly permit Men to be de-
ceivable. Big words indeed; but such as evidence that all Men who are in their wits do not constantly use them. For I pray, Sir, what doth Mr. S. think of the *Greek Church*? Had not those in it, Eyes, Ears, and other Senses, as well as in the *Latin*; Do not they pretend and appeal to what they receive from their *Fore-fathers* as well as the *Latins*? It seems then a deception is possible in the case of testifying, and therefore this doth more than permit Men to be *deceivable*; for there hath been an actual deception on one side or other. But we need not fear losing Mankind in this; for the possibility or Error supposeth Mankind to continue still; and if we take away that, we may sooner lose it than by the contrary. But what repugnancy can we imagine to Human Nature, that Men supposing Doctrines of Faith to come down from *Christ* or his *Apostles* should yet mistake in Judging what those Doctrines are? Had not Men Eyes, and Ears, and common Sense in *Christ* and the *Apostles* times? And yet we see even then the Doctrine of *Christ* was mistaken; and is it such a wonder it should be in succeeding Ages? Did not the *Nazarenes* mistake in point of Circumcision, the *Corinthians* as to the Resurrection, and yet the mean time agree in this, that *Christ's* Doctrine was the rule of Faith, or that they ought to believe nothing but what came from him? Did not the Disciples themselves err, even while they were with *Christ*, and certainly had Eyes, and Ears, and common Sense as other Men have, concerning some great Articles of Christian Faith, viz. *Christ's* Passion, Resurrection, and the nature of his Kingdom? If then such who had the greatest opportunities imaginable, and the highest Apprehensions of *Christ*, might so easily mistake in points of such moment, what ground have we to believe, that succeeding Ages should not be liable to such misapprehensions? And it was not merely the want of clear Divine Revelation which was the cause of their mistakes; for these things were plain enough to Persons not possessed with Prejudices; but those were so strong as to make them appre-

P. 205.

M m m m

hend

hence things quite another way than they ought to do. So it was then, and so it was in succeeding Ages; for let Parents teach what they pleased for Matters of Faith, yet prejudice and liabilities to mistake in Children, might easily make them misapprehend either the nature or weight of the Doctrines delivered to them. So that setting aside certain way of Recording the Matters of Faith in the Books of *Scripture*, and these preserved entire in every Age, it is an easie Matter to conceive, how in a short time *Christian Religion* would have been corrupted as much as ever any was in the World. For when we consider how much notwithstanding *Scripture*, the Pride, Passion, and Interests of Men have endeavoured to deface *Christian Religion* in the World, what would not these have done, if there had been no such certain Rule to Judge of it by? Mr. S. imagines himself *in repub. Platonis*, but it appears he is still *in face Romuli*; he satisfies there never were, nor could be any differences among *Christians*, and that all *Christians* made it their whole Business to teach their posterity Matters of Faith, and that they minded nothing in the World but the imprinting that on their minds that they might have it ready for their Children; and that all Parents had equal skill and fidelity in delivering Matters of Religion to their posterity. Whereas in truth, we find in the early Ages of the *Christian Church* several differences about Matters of Faith, and these differences continued to Posterity, but all Parties still pleading that their Doctrine came from the *Apostles*; and it fell out unhappily for Mr. S. that those were commonly most grossly deceived who pretended the most to Oral Tradition from the *Apostles*; still we find the grand debate was, what came from the *Apostles*, and what not? whereas had Tradition been so Infallible a way of conveying, how could this ever have come into debate among them? What, did not they know what their Parents taught them? It seems they did not, or their Parents were no more agreed than themselves; for their differences could never be ended this way. Afterwards came in for many Ages such a succession of Ignorance and Barbarism, that *Christian Religion* was little minded either by Parents or Children, as it ought to have been; instead of that, some sopperies and superstitions were hugely in request, and the Men who fomented these things were cried up as great *Saints* and workers of Miracles. So that the Miracles of *Francis* and *S. Dominick* were as much, if not more carefully conveyed from Parents to Children in that Age, than those of *Christ* and his *Apostles*; and on this account posterity must be equally bound to believe them, and have their Persons in equal veneration. If Men at last were grown wiser, it was because they did not believe Mr. S's principles, that they ought to receive what was delivered by their Parents; but they began to search and enquire into the writings of former Ages, and to examine the Opinions and practices of the present, with those of the primitive Church, and by this means there came a restoration of *Learning* and *Religion* together.

§. 5.

But that Matters of Fact be plain and evident in this Case, yet Mr. S. will prove it impossible there should any Errors come into the *Christian Church*; and his main Argument is this, *because no Age of the Church could conspire against her knowledge to deceive that Age immediately following, in Matter of Fact, evident in a manner to the whole World.* But before I come, more particularly, to shew the weakness of this Argument, by manifesting how Errors might come into the Church without such a Conspiracy as this is, I shall propound some *Queries* to him. 1. What Age of the Church he will instance in, wherein all Persons who were not cast out of the Church, had the same Apprehensions concerning all Points of Faith *i. e.* that none among

among them did believe more things delivered by Christ or the *Apostles* than others did. I am sure he can neither instance in the Age of the *Apostles* themselves, nor in those immediately succeeding them; unless Mr. S. the better to defend his *hypothesis*, will Question all written Records, because they consist of *dead letters*, and *unsens'd characters* and *wordish Testimonies*. Never considering, that while he utters this, he writes himself; unless he imagines there is more of *Life, Sense, and Certainty* in his *Books*, than in the *Scriptures* or any other writing whatsoever. 2. Where there were different Apprehensions in one Age of the Church, whether there must not be different Traditions in the next? For as he looks on all Parents as bound to teach their Children, so on Children as bound to believe what their Parents teach them. On which supposition different Traditions in the succeeding Age must needs follow, different Apprehensions in the precedent. 3. Whether Persons agreeing in the substance of Doctrines may not differ in their Apprehensions of the necessity of them? As for instance, all may agree in the Article of Christ's descent into Hell, but yet may differ in the explication of it, and in the Apprehension of the necessity of it in order to Salvation. So that we must not only in Tradition about Matters of Faith enquire, what was delivered, but under what notion it was delivered; whether as an allowable Opinion, or a necessary Point of Faith. But if several Persons, nay, multitudes in the Church may have different notions as to the necessity of the same Points, by what means shall we discern what was delivered as an Opinion in the Church, and what as an Article of Faith? But Mr. S. throughout his discourse takes it for granted, that there is the same necessity of believing and delivering all things which concern the Christian Doctrine; and still supposes the same *Sacredness, concern, necessity* in delivering all the Points in Controversie between the *Romanists* and Us, as there was in those main Articles of Faith, which they and we are agreed in. Which is so extravagant a supposition, that it is hard to conceive it should ever enter into the head of a Person pretending to Reason; but as extravagant as it is, it is that without which his whole Fabrick falls to the ground. For suppose we should grant him, that the infinite concerns which depend on the belief of the *Christian Doctrine* should be of so prevalent nature with the World, that it is impossible to conceive any one Age should neglect the knowing them, or conspire to deceive the next Age about them; yet what is all this to the Matters in difference between us? Will Mr. S. prove the same *sacredness, necessity, concern, and miraculously attestedness* (as he phrases it) in the *Invocation of Saints, Purgatory, Transubstantiation, Supremacy*, &c. as in the believing the Death and Resurrection of the Son of God? If he doth not prove this, he doth nothing; for his Arguments may hold for Doctrines Judged universally necessary, but for no other. Therefore Mr. S. hath a new task which he thought not of; which is, to manifest that these could not be looked on as *Opinions*, but were embraced as *necessary Articles of Faith*. For unless he proves them such, he can neither prove any obligation in Parents to teach them their *Children*, nor in *Children* to believe what their *Parents* taught, but only to hold them in the same degree which they did themselves. When Mr. S. will undertake to prove, that the whole Church, from the time of Christ, did agree in the points in difference between us, as necessary Articles of Faith, I may more easily believe, that no Age could be ignorant of them, or offer to deceive the next about them. But when Mr. S. reflects on his frequent concession, That there are *private Opinions* in the Church, distinct from *matters of Faith*

Faith, he must remember, before he can bring home his grounds to the case between their *Church* and ours, that he must prove none of the things in debate, were ever entertained as *private Opinions*, and that it is impossible for that which was a *private Opinion* in one Age, to become a *Matter of Faith* in the next.

§ 6.

But because this distinction of his ruins his demonstration, I shall first propound it in his own terms, and then shew how from thence it follows, that Errors may come into the *Church*, and be entertained as matters of Faith. His words are, *It being evident, that we have but two ways of ordinary knowledge, by acts of our Soul, or operations on our Body, that is, by Reason and Experience; the former of which belongs to Speculators or Doctors, the second to Deliverers of what was received, or Testifiers.* And this distinction he frequently admits, not only in the present Age of the *Church*, but in any; for the same reason will hold in all. From hence I propose several *Queries* farther to Mr. S. 1. If every one in the *Church* looked on himself as bound to believe just as the precedent Age did, whence came any to have *particular Opinions* of their own? For either the *Church* had delivered her sense in that case or not; if not, then Tradition is no certain conveyer of the *Doctrine of Christ*; if she had then those who vented private speculations were *Hereticks* in so doing; because they opposed that doctrine which the *Church* received from *Christ* and his *Apostles*. If Mr. S. replies, *that private speculations are in such cases where there is no Matter of Faith at all*, he can never be able to help himself by that distinction in the case of his own *Church*; for I demand, Whether it is a *Matter of Faith*, that Men ought to believe Oral Tradition infallible? If not, how can Men ground their Faith upon it? If it be, then either some are meer *speculators* in Matters of Faith; or all who believe on the account of the *Pope's Infallibility* are *Hereticks* for so doing. 2. If there were *speculators* in former Ages as well as this, whether did those Men believe their own *speculations* or no? If not, then the *Fathers* were great *Impostors*, who vented those *speculations* in the *Church* which they did not believe themselves. And it is plain, Mr. S. Speaks of such *Opinions* which the Asserters of, do firmly believe to be true: And if they did, then they looked on themselves as bound to believe something which was not founded on the Tradition of the *Church*; and consequently, did not own Oral Tradition, as the *Rule of Faith*. So that as many *speculators* as we find in the *Church*, so many *Testifiers* we have against the *Infallibility of Oral Tradition*. 3. Whether those Persons who did themselves believe those *Opinions* to be true, did not think themselves obliged to tell others they ought to believe them; and consequently, to deliver these as Matters of Faith to their Children? Let Mr. S. shew me any inconsequence in this; but that it unavoidably follows upon his principles, that they were bound to teach their Children what themselves received as the *Doctrine of Christ*; and that the obligation is in all respects equal as if they had believed these things on the account of Oral Tradition. 4. If Children be obliged to believe what their Parents teach them for matters of Faith, then, upon Mr. S's own concessions, is not Posterity bound to believe something which Originally came not from *Christ* or his *Apostles*? For it appears in this case, that the first rise was from a private Opinion of some *Doctors* of the *Church*; But they believing these *Opinions* themselves, think themselves Obligated to Propagate them to others; and by reason of their Learning and Authority, these *Opinions* may by degrees gain a general acceptance in the ruling part

part of the *Church*; and all who believe them true, think they ought to teach them their *Children*; and *Children* they are to believe what their *Parents* teach them. Thus from Mr. S's *Own Principles*, things that never were delivered by *Christ* or his *Apostles*, may come to be received as matter of Faith in the present *Church*. Thus the intelligent Reader needs no body's help but Mr. S. to let him understand how *Invocation of Saints*, *Purgatory*, *Transubstantiation*, &c. though never delivered either by *Christ* or his *Apostles*, may yet now be looked on as *Articles of Faith*, and yet no Age of the *Church* conspire to deceive another. Either then Mr. S. must say, there never were any *Private Opiniators* or *Speculators* in the *Church*, as distinct from *Testifiers*, and then he unavoidably contradicts himself; or he must deny that *Posterity* is bound to Believe what their *Fore-fathers* delivered them as *Matters of Faith*; which destroys the force of his whole demonstration. Perhaps he will answer. *That Children are not bound to believe what barely their Parents, or any other Number of Persons might deliver as Matters of Faith but what the whole Church of every Age delivers.* This, though the only thing to be said in the case, yet is most unreasonable, because it runs Men upon inextricable difficulties in the way of their resolving Faith. For suppose any *Children* taught by their *Parents* what they are to believe; Mr. S. must say, they are not bound to believe them presently, but to enquire whether they agree with the whole *Church* of that *Age* first, before they can be obliged to assent. Which being an impossible task either for *Children*, or *Men of Age*, to find out in the way of *Oral Tradition*, this way of resolving Faith, doth but offer a fairer pretence for *Infidelity*. For we see, how impossible it is for Mr. S. To make it appear, that their *Church* is agreed about the *Rule of Faith*; for by his own *Confession*, the far greater number as *speculators* oppose the way asserted by him; how much more difficult then must it needs be, to find out what the sense of the whole *Essential Church* is in all matters which *Parents* may teach their *Children* for *Doctrines of Faith*? So that if *Children* are not bound to believe what their *Parents* teach them, till they know they teach nothing but what the whole *Church* teaches, it is the most compendious way to teach them, they are not bound to believe at all. But if this *Distinction* be admitted, as Mr. S. makes much use of it, then it appears, how errors may come into the *Church* at first under the notion of *speculations*, and by degrees to be delivered as points of *Faith*, by which means those things may be received in the *Church*. For such, which were never delivered by *Christ* or his *Apostles*, and yet no Age conspire to deceive the next which was the thing to be shewed.

This is one way of shewing how *Errors* may come into the *Church*, without one *Ages* conspiring to deceive the next; but besides this, there are several others I might insist upon; but I shall mention only two more: 1. Mis-interpreting the Sense of *Scripture*. 2. Supposing it in the power of some part of the *Church* to oblige the whole in matters of Faith. For the *First* we are to consider, that no imaginable account can be given either of the *Writing* or *Universal Reception* of the *Books* of the *New Testament*, if they were not designed for the preservation of the *Doctrine of Christ*. And although it should be granted possible for the *Main* and *Fundamental Articles* of *Christian Faith* (such as the *Apostles Creed* gives a *Summary Account* of) to have been preserved by the help of *Tradition*; yet, unless we be extremely ungratefull,

§. 7.

we

we cannot but acknowledge, that God hath infinitely better provided for us, in not leaving the grounds of our Religion to the mere breath of the People, or the care of Mothers instructing their Children, but hath given us the certain records of all the Doctrines and Motives of Faith, preserved inviolably from the first Ages of the Church. And when the Church saw with what care God had provided for the means of Faith, Oral Tradition was little minded; thence the memory of those other things not recorded in Scripture is wholly lost; all the care was imployed in searching, preserving, and delivering these sacred Books to Posterity. To these the primitive Church still appeals; these they plead for against all Adversaries, defending their Authority explaining their sense, vindicating them from all Corruptions. Tradition they rely not on, any farther than as a Testimony of the truth of these records, or to clear the sense of them from the perverse Interpretation of those Hereticks who pretended another kind of Tradition than what was in Scripture. And when these were silenced, all the disputes that arose in the Church concerning Matters of Faith, were about the sense of these Books; as is evident by the proceedings in the case of Arius and Pelagius. Wherein Tradition was only used as a means to clear the sense of the Scriptures, but not at all as that which the Faith of all was to be resolved into. But when any thing was pleaded from Tradition, for which there was no ground in Scripture, it was rejected with the same ease it was offered; and such Persons were plainly told, this was not the Church's way; if they had plain Scripture with the concurrent sense of Antiquity, they might produce it, and rely upon it. So that the whole use of Tradition in the primitive Church (besides attesting the Books) was, to shew the unreasonableness of imposing Senses on Scripture, against the Universal Sense of the Church from the Apostles times. But as long as Men were Men, it was not avoidable, but they must fall into different apprehensions of the meaning of the Scripture, according to their different Judgments, Prejudices, Learning and Education. And since they had all this Apprehension, that the Scripture contained all Doctrines of Faith, thence as Men Judged of the Sense of it, they differed in their Apprehension, concerning Matters of Faith. And thence Errors and mistakes might easily come into the Church, without one Age conspiring to deceive the next. Nay, if it be possible for Men to rely on Tradition without Scripture this may easily be done; for by that means they make a new Rule of Faith, not known to the primitive Church, and consequently, that very assertion is an Error in which the former Age did not conspire to deceive the next. And if these things be possible, Mr. S's demonstration fails him; for hereby a Reasonable Account is given, how Errors may come into a Church without one Age conspiring to deceive another. Again, let me enquire of Mr. S. Whether Men may not believe it in the Power of the ruling part of the Church, to oblige the whole to an assent to the definitions of it? To speak plainer, Is it not possible for Men to believe the Pope and Council infallible in their decrees? And I hope the Jesuits (as little as Mr. S. loves them, or they him) may be a sufficient evidence of more than the bare possibility of this. If they may believe this, doth it not necessarily follow, that they are bound to believe whatever they declare to be Matter of Faith? Supposing then, that Transubstantiation, Supremacy, Invocation of Saints were but private Opinions before but are now defined by Pope and Council, these Men cannot but look on themselves as much obliged to believe them, as if they had been delivered as Matters of Faith, in every Age since the Apostles times. Is it now

now repugnant to common Sense that this Opinion should be believed or entertained in the Church? if not, why may not this Opinion be generally received? if it be so, doth it not unavoidably follow, that the Faith of Men must alter according to the Church's definitions? And thus private Opinions may be believed as Articles of Faith and corrupt Practices be established as laudable Pieces of Devotion, and yet no one Age of the Church conspire to deceive another. Thus I hope Mr. S. may see how far it is from being a self-evident Principle, that no Error can come into the Church, unless one Age conspire to deceive the next in a Matter of Fact, evident in a manner to the whole World. Which is so wild an apprehension, that I believe the Jesuits cannot entertain themselves without smiles, to see their Domestick Adversaries expose themselves to contempt with so much confidence.

Thus I come to the Reason I gave; why there is no Reason to believe that this is the present Sense of the Roman Church. My words are, For I see the Roman Church asserts that things may be *de fide* in one Age, which were not in another; at least Popes and Councils challenge this; and this is the common Doctrine maintained there, and others are looked on as no members of their Church who assert the contrary; but as Persons at least meritoriously, if not actually excommunicate. Where then shall I satisfy myself, what the Sense of your Church is, as to this particular? Must I believe a very few Persons, whom the rest disown as Heretical and Seditious? or ought I not rather to take the Judgment of the greatest and most approved Persons of that Church? And these disown any such Doctrine; but assert that the Church may determine things *de fide*, which were not before. In Answer to this Mr. S. begs leave to distinguish the words *de fide*, which may either mean Christian Faith, or Points of Faith taught by Christ; and then he grants, 'tis nonsense to say, they can be in one Age, and not in another. Or *de fide* may mean Obligatory to be believed. In this latter Sense none I think (saith he) denies things to be *de fide* in one Age and not in another; in the former Sense none hold it. Upon which very triumphantly he concludes, What's now become of your difficulty? I believe you are in some wonderment, and think I elude it rather than Answer it; I shall endeavour to unperplex you. I must confess it a fault of Human Nature, to admire things which Men understand not; on which account I cannot free myself from some temptation to that he calls wonderment; but I am presently cured of it, when I endeavour to reduce his distinction to reason. For instead of explaining his Terms, he should have shewed how any thing can be obligatory to be believed in any Age of the Church, which was no Point of Faith taught by Christ, which notwithstanding his endeavour to unperplex me, is a thing as yet I Apprehend not; because I understand no obligation to Faith to arise from any thing but Divine Revelation; and I do not yet believe any thing in Christian Doctrine to be divinely revealed, but what was delivered by Christ or his Apostles. And my wonderment must needs be the greater; because I suppose this inconsistent with Mr. S's principles. For Oral Tradition doth necessarily imply, that all Points of Faith were first taught by Christ, and conveyed by Tradition to us; but if a thing may be *de fide* in this latter Sense, which was not before, what becomes of resolving Faith wholly into Oral Tradition? For Faith is resolved into that from whence the obligation to believe comes; but here Mr. S. confesses, that the obligation to believe doth arise from something quite different from Oral Tradition; and therefore Faith must be resolved into it. Besides, all the Sense I can find in that distinction, is, that Men are bound to believe something in one Age, which they were not in another; and if so, I shall desire Mr. S. to unperplex me in this, how every Age is bound to believe just as the precedent did,

§. 8.

P. 205.

P. 206.

did, and yet one Age be bound to believe more than the precedent. But however, I am much obliged to him for his endeavour to *unperplex me*, as he speaks; for really I look on no civilities to be greater than those which are designed for clearing our understandings; so great an adorer am I of true Reason and an intelligible Religion. And therefore I perfectly agree with him in his saying, *that Christianity aims not to make us Beasts, but more perfectly Men; and the perfection of our manhood consists in the use of our Reasons.* From whence he infers, that it is reasonable, consequences should be drawn from principles of Faith, *which, he saith, are of two sorts; first such as need no more but common Sense to deduce them; the others are such as need the Maxims of some science got by speculation to infer them; and these are Theological conclusions: The former sort, he tells us, the Church is necessitated to make use of upon occasion, i. e. when any Heretick questions those, and eadem opera, the whole Point of Faith itself, of which they were a part; as in the Case of the Monothelities, about Christ's having two Wills.* But all this while; I am far enough from being *unperplexed*; nay by this discourse, I see every one who offers to *unperplex* another, is not very clear himself. For since he makes no Theological conclusions to be *de fide*, but only such consequences as common Sense draws, I would willingly understand how Common Sense receives a new Obligation to Faith. For to my Apprehension the deducing of consequences from principles by common Sense, is not an act of believing, but of knowledge consequent upon a Principle of Faith. And the meaning is no more than this, That Men, when they say they believe things, should not contradict themselves, as certainly they would do, if they deny those consequences which common Sense draws from them. As in the Case of the Monothelities, for Men to assert, that Christ had two Natures, and yet not two Wills; when the will is nothing else but the inclination of the nature to that good which belongs to it. So that there can be no distinct Obligation to believe such consequences as are drawn by common Sense; but every one that believes the Principles from whence they are drawn, is thereby bound to believe all the consequences which immediately follow from them. Indeed the Church, when People will be so unreasonable to deny such things, may explain her Sense of the Article of Faith in those Terms which may best prevent dispute; but this is only to discriminate the Persons who truly believe this Article, from such as do not. Not that any new Obligation to Faith results from this act of the Church; but the better to prevent cavils, she explains her Sense of the Article itself in more explicate Terms. Which, as he saith, *is only to put the Faith out of danger of being equivocated.* Which is quite another thing from causing a new obligation to believe. As suppose the Church, to prevent the growth of the Socinian Doctrine, should require from Men the declaring their belief of the eternal existence of the Son of God; Would this be to bind Men to believe something which they were not bound to before? No, but only to express their assent to the Deity of Christ in the simplest Terms; because otherwise they might call him God by Office, and not by Nature. Now how can any one conceive, that any should be first obliged to believe, that Christ is God, and yet receive a new Obligation afterwards to believe his eternal existence? Thus it is in all immediate consequences drawn by common Sense; in all which the primary obligation to believe the thing itself, extends to the belief of it in the most clear and least controverted Terms, which are not intended to impose on Mens Faith, but to promote the Church's peace. For neither is there a new object of Faith; for how can that be, which common Sense draws from what is believed already? neither is there any infallible proponent,

ment, unless common Sense hath usurped the Pope's Prerogative. But Mr. S. offers at a reason for this, which is, *that none can have an Obligation to believe what they have not an Obligation to think of; and in some Age the generality of the Faithful have no occasion, nor consequently Obligation to mind, reflect, or think on those propositions involved in the main stock of Faith.* From whence, he saith, it follows, *that a thing may be de fide, or obligatory to be believed in one Age, and not in another.* But let Mr. S. shew, how a Man can be obliged to believe any thing as an Article of Faith, who is not bound to think of all the immediate consequences of it? Because Faith is an Act of a reasonable Nature, which ought to enquire into the reasons and consequences of things which it doth believe. But Mr. S's mistake lies here, in not distinguishing the Obligation to believe from the Obligation to an explicit declaration of that assent. The former comes only from God, and no new Obligation can arise from any Act of the Church; but the latter being a thing tending to the Church's Peace, may be required by it on some Occasions; *i.e.* when the Doctrine is assaulted by Hereticks, as in the time of the four First General Councils; but still a Man is not at all the more obliged to Assent, but to Express his Assent in order to the Church's Satisfaction.

But Mr. S. supposes me to enquire, *how the Church can have Power to oblige the generality to belief of such a Point.* To which his Answer is, *she obliges them to believe the main Point of Faith, by virtue of Traditions, being a self-evident Rule, and these implied Points by virtue of their being self-evidently connected with those main and perpetually used Points, so that the vulgar can be rationally and connaturally made capable of this their Obligation.* But we are not now enquiring, what the Obligation to believe the main Points of Faith is, nor whether Tradition be a self-evident Rule; but how there should be a new Obligation to believe something self-evidently connected with the former Points, is beyond my capacity to understand. And they must be vulgar understandings indeed, that can rationally and connaturally be made capable of such an Obligation. For if it be self-evidently connected with the main Points, no one can believe the one, without believing the other; for nothing is self-evident, but what a Man Assents to at the first Apprehension of it; and if he doth so, how comes there a new Obligation to believe it? Is it possible to believe, that any thing consists of parts, and not believe that that whole is greater than any of those parts? for this is a thing self-evidently connected with the nature of the whole. But these are self-evident Riddles, as the former were unintelligible demonstrations. And yet, though these be rare Theories, the Application of them to the case of the Roman Church exceeds all the rest. Whence, saith he, *the Government of our Church is still justified to be sweet, and according to right nature, and yet forcible and efficacious.* Although I admire many things in Mr. S's Book, yet I cannot say I do any thing more than this passage, that *because Men are obliged to believe no implied Point, but such as are self-evidently connected with the main ones, therefore the Government of the Roman Church is sweet, and according to right nature, &c.* Alas then, how much have we been mistaken all this while, that have charged her with imposing hard and unsufferable conditions of communion with her! No, she is so gentle and sweet, that she requires nothing but the main Points on the account of a self-evident rule, and implied Points by reason of self-evident connexion with the former. I see Mr. S. (if he will make good his word) is the only Person who is ever like to reconcile me with the Church of Rome: For I assure you, I never desire any better Terms of Communion with a Church, than to have no main Points of

N n n n

Faith

§. 9.
P. 208.

Faith required from me to Assent to, but what are built on a *self-evident Rule*, nor any implied Points but such as are *self-evidently connected* with the former. And no work can be more easy, than to convince me upon these grounds; for all endeavours of proof are taken away by the things being said to be *self-evident*. For the very offer of proof that they are so, *self-evidently* proves they are not so. For what ever is proved by some thing beside itself, can never be said without a contradiction to be *self-evident*. But not to tie up Mr. S. from his excellent faculty of proving, if Mr. S. will prove to me that any of the Points in difference between us, as *Transubstantiation*, *Purgatory*, *Supremacy* of the *Roman Church*, &c. have any *self-evident connexion* with any main Point of Faith in the *Apostles Creed*, I solemnly Promise him to retract all I have writ against that Church; so far shall I be from needing a new Obligation to believe them. But if these be so remote from *self-evidence*, that they are plainly repugnant to Sense and Reason (witness that *self-evident Doctrine* of *Transubstantiation*) what then must we think of Mr. S.? Surely the least is, that since his being a *Roman Catholick*, his mind is strangely enlightened, so far that those things are *self-evident* to him, which are contradictions to the rest of the World. But withall Mr. S. acquaints us with another Mystery; which is, how these Points descended by a kind of Tradition, and yet confesses, they were never thought of or reflected on by the generality, till the Church took occasion to explain them. Such a silent Tradition doth very suitably follow the former *self-evident connexion*. For he that can believe *Transubstantiation* to be *self-evident*, no wonder if he believes that to have been delivered by a constant Tradition, which was never heard of from the *Apostles times* to these.

Now Mr. S. is pleased to return to me, and draws up a fresh charge against me, which is, that I act like a Politician, and would conquer them by first dividing them, and making odious comparisons between two Parties of Divines. But to shew us how little they differ, he distinguishes them, as faithfull, and as private discoursers; in the former notion, he saith, they all hold the same divinely constituted Church-Government, and the same *self-evident Rule* of Faith; but as private Discoursers he acknowledges they differ in the explication of their belief. I meddle not here with the Government of their Church, (which I have elsewhere proved to be far enough from being divinely constituted) but with the Rule of Faith; and the Question is, Whether the infallibility of Oral Tradition, be that *self-evident Rule* which that Church proceeds on; Yes, saith Mr. S. they are all as faithfull agreed in it, but as discoursers they differ about it. Which in short is, that all in the Church of Rome, who are not of his Opinion, know not what they say; and that they oppose that which they do really believe. Which in plain English is, that they are egregious dissemblers and prevaricators in Religion, that they do intolerably flatter the Pope and present Church with loud declamations for their Infallibility, but they do really believe no such thing, but resolve all into Oral Tradition. But is not this an excellent Agreement among them, when Mr. White and his party not only disown the common Doctrine of the Infallibility of Pope and Councils, but dispute against it as pernicious and destructive to Christian Faith? on the other side the far greater part of Romanists say, there can be no certainty of Faith, unless there be an Infallible Divine Testimony in the present Church, and this lodged in Pope and Councils; that those who endeavour to overthrow this, are Dangerous, Seditious, Heretical Persons. Accordingly their Books are censured at Rome, their Opinions disputed against, and their Persons condemned. And yet all this while, we must believe that these stick together like two smooth Marbles as faithfull, though they

they are knocked one against another as Discourfers; and that they perfectly agree in the same self-evident Rule of Faith, when all their Quarrels and Contentions are about it; and those mannaged with so great heat, that Heresie is charged of one side, and Arch-heresie and undermining Religion on the other. Doth he think we never heard of Mr. White's *Sonus Succina*, nor of that Chapter in it, where he saith, That the Doctrine of Pope and Councils Infallibility tends to overthrow the certainty of Christian Faith; and that the Propagating such a Doctrine is a greater Crime than Burning Temples, Ravishing the Sacred Virgins on the Altars, Trampling on the Body of Christ, or the sending the Turk or Antichrist into Christian Countries? Or doth he think we can believe that the Pope and Cardinals, the Jesuits and all the Papists of foreign Countries do as Faithfull agree with Mr. White in this? It seems not so by the proceedings in the Court of Rome against him, in which as appears by the Censure of Inquisition against him, dated the 17th of November 1661. His Doctrine is Condemned not only as False, Seditious and Scandalous, but as Heretical and Erroneous in Faith. And if it were not for this very Doctrine he was there Censured, why doth Mr. White set himself purposely to defend it in his *Tabula Suffragiales*? If these then do agree as Faithfull, who cannot but envy the excellent Harmony of the Roman Church, in which Men condemn each other for Hereticks, and yet all believe the same things still? Well, Sir, I am in hopes upon the same grounds Mr. S. will yield us the same Charity too, and tell us, that we agree with him as Faithfull, only we differ a little from him as Discourfers; for I assure you, there is as great Reason: the only Difference is, we give them not such Ill words as they do each other. For let Mr. S. shew us wherein we differ more from him about the Rule of Faith, than they do among themselves: For Mr. White when he hath said, That all kind of Heresie doth arise from hence, that Men make the Holy Scripture, or a private Spirit, the Rule of Faith; he presently adds, It is all one, if one make Councils or Pope any other way than as Witnesses to be the Authors of Faith. For, saith he, This is to subject the whole Church to that Slavery, to receive any Error for an Article of Faith, which they shall define, or propose modo illegitimo, i. e. Any other way than as Witnesses of Tradition. Either then we differ from Mr. S. only as Discourfers, or he and his Brethren differ from each other more than as such. And so any one would think who Reads the Oppositions and Arguments against each other on this Subject, particularly Mr. Whites *Tabula suffragiales*. But let Mr. White say what he will Mr. S. tells me, I am not aware how little they differ even as Divines. The more shame for them to have such Furious Heats and Oppositions where there is so little difference. But as little as they differ, Mr. White thinks it safer to talk of their unity in England, than to try whether they be of his mind at Rome, by going thither to clear himself; For he justly fears he should find them differ from him some other way than as bare Discourfers. Yet let us hear Mr. S's reason; for, saith he, Though some Speculators attribute to the Church a Power of Defining things not held before, yet few will say she hath new Revelations or new Articles of Faith. But we know the temper of these Men better than to rely on what they barely say. For they say what they think is most for their purpose; and one of Mr. White's Adversaries, (if himself may be credited) plainly told him, If the Doctrine of the Popes Infallibility were not true, yet it ought to be defended, because it was for the Interest of the Church of Rome: For which he is

sufficiently rebuked by him. It is one thing then what they say, and another what necessarily follows from the Doctrine which they assert. But for plain dealing comment me to the Canonists, who say expressly, The Church (by which they mean the Pope) may make *New Articles of Faith*: And this is the Sense of the rest, though they are loth to Speak out. Else Mr. White was much to blame in spending so much Time in promoting the contrary. But what Man of Common Sense can Imagine that these Men can mean otherwise, who assert such Infallibility in Pope and Councils, as to oblige Men under pain of Eternal Damnation to Believe those things which they were not obliged to, before such a Definition? And what can this be else but to make new Articles of Faith? For an Article of Faith supposes a necessary Obligation to Believe it: Now if some Doctrine may become thus Obligatory by Virtue of the Church's Definition which was not so before, that becomes thereby an Article of Faith which was not before. But these Subtile Men have not yet learn'd to distinguish a *New Article of Faith*: they do not indeed pretend that their Doctrine is New, because they deny any such thing as new Revelation in the Church; but yet they must needs say, if they understand themselves, that Old implicit Doctrines, may become new Articles of Faith by virtue of the Church's definition. So little are they relieved by that silly distinction of *explicit and implicit delivery* of them, which Mr. S. for a great Novelty acquaints us with. For what is only *implicitly delivered*, is no Article of Faith at all: for that can be no Article of Faith, which Men are not bound to believe; now there are none will say that Men are bound to believe under pain of Damnation if they do not, the things which are only implicitly delivered; but this they say with great confidence of all things defined by the Church. And let now any intelligent Person judge; whether those who assert such things, do not differ wide enough from those who resolve all into *Oral Tradition*, and make the Obligation to Faith wholly dependant upon the constant Tradition of any Doctrine from Age to Age ever since the *Apostles* times.

§. 11.

But Mr. S. is yet farther displeased with me for saying, That Pope and Councils challenge a Power to make things *de fide* in one Age, which were not in another. For 1. he says, I speak it in common, and prove it not. 2. He adds, That take them right, this is both perfectly Innocent, and unavoidably necessary to a Church. And is it not strange he should expect any particular proofs of so innocent and necessary a thing to the being of a Church? But he will tell me, it is in his own Sense of *de fide*, which I have already shown to signify nothing to his purpose. Let him therefore speak out, whether he doth believe any such thing as inherent Infallibility in the definitions of Pope and Councils? if not, I am sure at Rome they will never believe that Mr. S. agrees with them as faithful; if he doth, whether doth not such an Infallible definition bind Men by virtue of it to the belief of what is then defined? if it doth, then things may become as much *de fide* by it, as if they were delivered by Christ or his Apostles. For thereby is supposed an equal Obligation to Faith, because there is a proposition equally Infallible. But will he say, the Pope doth not challenge this? Why then is the contrary Doctrine Censured and Condemned at Rome? Why is the other so eagerly contended for, by the most Zealous Sons of that Church, and that not as a School-opinion, but as the only certain Foundation of Faith? Mr. S. is yet pleased to inform me farther, that nothing will avail me but this, if a Pope and Council should define a new thing, and declare they ground themselves on

New

New Lights, as did their first Reformers in England: but I shall find, he saith, no such Fopperies in Faith-definitions made by the Catholick Church. Is this the Man who made choice of Reason for his weapon? could there be a greater Calumny cast on our Church, than to say, her Reformers grounded themselves on new Lights? when our great charge against the Church of Rome is for introducing Novelties, and receding from pure and primitive Antiquity. Whether the charge be true or no, yet sure it follows they did not declare they ground themselves on new lights, but expressly the contrary. Well, but Pope and Councils neither define new things, nor ground themselves on them: but what means the Man of Reason? that they make no new definitions: surely not; for then what did they meet for? and what mean their Decrees but he intends, that they deliver no new Doctrine: but how must that be tried? or hath Mr. S. gained the Opinion of Infallibility both from Pope and Councils, that we must believe his bare word? but we not only say but prove that even their last Council hath defined many things, which never were delivered by Christ or his Apostles. And it is to no purpose whether they say they ground themselves on new Lights, or pretend to an Infallible assistance; for it comes all to the same at last. For if the assistance be infallible, what matter is it whether the Doctrine hath been revealed or no? for on this supposition it is impossible that Pope and Council should miscarry. Therefore if any Church be guilty of Fopperies in Faith-definitions, it must be that which you miscall the Catholick, but is more truly known by the Name of the Roman Church. There is yet one piece of Mr. S's sagacity to be taken notice of as to this particular, which is, that I am at an end of my Argument, because I say the Opinion of the Pope and Councils Infallibility is the common Doctrine maintained: in which I confound the Church with the Schools, or some private Opiniators, and then carp at those Men's Tenets. And this is the force of all that Paragraph, He tells me, I want not Wit to know that no sober Catholick holds human deductions the Rule of their Faith, Schoolmen definers of it, nor the Schools the Tribunal whence to propose it Authoritatively and Obligingly to the generality of the Faithfull. Neither doth Mr. S. want the wit to know that our present Inquiry is concerning the Sense of their present Church about the Rule of Faith. Since then Mr. S. must confess it necessary to Faith to know what the certain Rule of it is; let me inquire farther, whether any particular Person can know certainly what it is, unless he knows what the Church owns for her Rule of Faith; and whether that may be owned as the Church's Judgment, which is stiffly opposed by the most interested Persons in the Roman Church, and the most zealous contenders for it? Especially when the Pope who is said to be Head of the Church, condemns the Doctrine asserted, and that only by a small number of such who are as much opposed by themselves, as by any of us. Is it then possible to know the Church's Judgment or not? if not, 'tis to no purpose to search for a Rule of Faith: if it be, which way can we come to know it, either by most Voices or the Sense of the Governors of the Church: either of the ways, I dare put it to a fair tryal whether Oral Tradition, or the Infallibility of Pope and Councils be the Doctrine most owned in the Church of Rome? But Mr. S. still tells us, These are only private Opiniators and Schoolmen who assert the contrary Doctrine to his. But will not they much more say on the other side, that this way of Oral Tradition is a Novel Fancy of some few half Catholicks in England, and tends to subvert the Roman Church. But is the present Pope with Mr. S. a private Opiniator, or was the last a mere Schoolman? I am sure what ever Mr. S. thinks of him, he thought not so of himself when he said, he was no Divine in the controversie

Controversie of *Jansenius*. Doth the Court of Rome signifie no more with Mr. S. than a Company of *scholastick Pedants* that know not what the Sense of the Church is, concerning the rule of Faith? I meddle not with the Schools but with the Authority of the present Church, and him whom Mr. S. owns for the Head of it: and is it consistent with his headship to condemn that Doctrine which contains in it the only certain rule of Faith? Mr. S. may then see they were no such impertinent *Topicks* which I insisted on, and as stout as Mr. S. seems to be, I am apt to believe he would not look on the censure of the *Inquisition* as an impertinent *Topick*.

§. 12.

But at last Mr. S. offers at something whereby he would satisfy me of the Sense of the Church, as to this particular, and therefore asks, *Whether I never heard of such a thing as the Council of Trent?* I must ingenuously confess I have; and seen more a great deal of it, than I am satisfied with. But what of that? there, he tells me, *I may find a clear solution of any doubt by the constant procedure of that most grave Synod in it's definitions.* That is, I hope to find that Oral Tradition was acknowledged there as the only self-evident rule of Faith. If I do this, I confess my self satisfied in this enquiry. But how much to the contrary is there very obvious in the proceedings of it? For in the 4th Session the Decree is, *That Scripture and Tradition should be embraced with equal Piety and reverence;* and the Reason is, *because the Doctrine of Faith is contain'd partly in Scripture, partly in Tradition;* but what Arts must Mr. S. use to infer from hence, that Oral Tradition in contradistinction to Scripture was looked on as the only rule of Faith? I cannot but say, that the ruling Men of that Council were Men wise enough in their Generation; and they were too wise wholly to exclude Scripture; but because they knew that of itself could not serve their purposes, they therefore help it out with Tradition, and make both together the complete rule of Faith. Where I pray in all the proceedings of that Council doth Mr. S. find them define any thing on the Account of Oral Tradition? Instead of which we find continual bandying about the Sense of Scripture and Fathers, which might have been all spared, if they had been so wise as to consider, they could not but know the Sense of the present Church, nor that of the precedent, and so up to the time of Christ. But they were either so ignorant as not to light on this happy invention; or so wise and knowing as to despise it. It is true, they would not have their Doctrines looked on as novelties, therefore they speak much of Tradition and the Ancient Faith; but that was not by what their Parents taught them, but what the Fathers of the Church delivered in their writings; for by these they Judged of Traditions, and not the Oral way. And therefore I see little Reason to believe, that this was either the Sense of the Council of Trent, or is the Sense of any number of Roman Catholicks, much less of the whole Church, none excepted, as Mr. S. in his confident way expresses it. And if he will, as he saith, *disavow the maintaining any Point, or affecting any way which is not assented to by all.* I hope to see Mr. S. retract this Opinion, and either fall in with the Court of Rome, or return, as reason leads him, into the bosom of the Church of England. But there seems to be somewhat more in what follows, viz. that though Schoolmen Question the Personal Infallibility of the Pope, or of the Roman Clergy, nay of a General Council, yet all affirm the Infallibility of Tradition, or the living voice of the Church essential; and this, he saith, is held by all, held firmly, and that it is absolutely Infallible. To this therefore I answer, either Mr. S. means that none do affirm that the universal Tradition of the Church essential can err, or that the Church of Rome, being the Church Essential, cannot err in her Tradition: But which way

away soever he takes it, I shall easily shew how far it is from proving that his designs it for. For if he take it in the first Sense, viz. that all the faithful in all Ages could not consent in an Error, then he may as well prove Protestants of his mind as Papists; for this is the Foundation, on which we believe the particular Books of Scripture. If this therefore proves any thing, it proves more than he intends, viz. that while we thus oppose each other, we do perfectly agree together; and truly so we do, as much as they do among themselves. But if Mr. S.'s meaning be, that all of their Religion own the Roman Church to be the Church essential, and on that account, that it cannot err, (setting aside the absurdity of the Opinion it self,) I say from hence it doth not follow, that they make Oral Tradition the rule of Faith, because it is most evident, that the ground why they say their Church cannot err, is not on Mr. S.'s Principles, but on the supposition of an Infallible assistance, which preserves that Church from Error. So that this falls far short of proving, that they are all agreed in this Rule of Faith; which is a thing so far from probability, that he might, by the same argument prove, that Scripture is owned by them all to be the Rule of Faith. For I hope it is held by all, and held firmly, that the living voice of God in Scripture, as delivered to us, is Infallible; and if so, then there is as much ground for this as the other. But if we enquire what it is Men make a Rule of Faith, we must know not only that they believe Tradition Infallible, but on what account they do so. For if Tradition be believed Infallible barely on the account of a promise of Infallibility to the present Church, then the Resolution of Faith is not into the Tradition, but into that Infallible assistance; and consequently the Rule of Faith is not, what bare Tradition delivers, but what that Church, which cannot err in Judging Tradition, doth propose to us. It is not therefore their being agreed in General, that Tradition is Infallible, doth make them agree in the same Rule of Faith; but they must agree in the ground of that Infallibility, viz. That it depends on this, That no Age should conspire to deceive the next. But all Persons who understand any thing of the Roman Church, know very well that the general Reason why Tradition is believed Infallible, is, because they first believe the Church to be Infallible; whereas Mr. S. goes the contrary way, and makes the Infallibility of the Church, to depend on the Infallibility of Tradition. And therefore, for all that I can see, we must still oppose private Opinions in this Controversie; the Church of Rome, not having declared her self at all on Mr. S.'s behalf, but the contrary, and the generality believing on the Account of the present Church's Infallibility. And it is strange Mr. S. should find no difference between Mens resolving Faith in common Sense, and into the Immediate assistance of the Holy Ghost. If this then be the first Principle of Controversie, as Mr. S. pretends, we see how unlikely they are to agree about other Matters, who are so much divided about the Principle of resolving them. And if this be the ground of Faith, then most Romanists build on a wrong Foundation. But if the Infallibility of Oral Tradition be the Foundation on which that formidable structure is erecting, which he speaks of, we then to the Court of Rome, for that is known to build on quite a different Foundation. And if this, as he saith, Rises apace, and has advanced many stories in a small time, it only lets us know how fast their divisions grow, and that they are building so fast one against another, that their Church will not stand between them. By this Discourse, Mr. S. pretends To Answer all those If's which follow; which are these, In Case the Church may Determine things de fide, which were not before, whether the present Church doth then believe as the precedent did or no? if

it did, how comes any thing to be *de fide* which was not before? if it did not, what assurance can I have that every Age of the Church believes just as the precedent did, and no otherwise? When I see they profess the contrary? And if a thing may be *de fide* in one Age, which was not in a foregoing, then a Church may deliver that as a Matter of Faith as one thing, which was never accounted so before; and by which means the present Church may oblige me to believe that as a Matter of Faith, which never was so in Christ's or the Apostles times, and so the Infallibility on the account of Tradition is destroyed. To all which Mr. S. gives a very easie Answer, viz. that they do not hold any disparate or unimplied Points of Faith; but such as are involved and implied in the main Point. This is no more easily said than understood; for if these be implied in the former, how can there come a new Obligation to believe them? For to take his own Instance, will any Man in his Senses say, that he that believes *homo est animal rationale*, doth not believe *homo est animal*? And this he makes choice of as an example, how one Point of Faith may be involved in another, as to receive a distinct Obligation to believe it. I grant that *homo est animal* is involved in the other; but he that shall say, that after he hath assented to that Proposition, *homo est animal rationale*, he may be capable of a new Obligation to believe the former, which is involved in this, it may be justly Questioned whether such an one, as to himself, can truly say, *homo est animal rationale*, or no. But after such rare subtilties, he doth very well to tell me, That I ought to consider what Logick tells me, that the Conclusion is in the Premises, which Reflection (in his court-like expression) he saith, will much unblunder my Thoughts. But let the conclusion be as long as it will in the Premises, will any Man in his wits say, that he that believes the Truth of the Premises, is not hereby bound to believe the Conclusion? and the more the one is involved in the other, the less is it possible to make the Obligation to believe them distinct. And it is hard for me to believe, that this is a way to unblunder my thoughts, when I see what horrible Confusion such expressions argue in his own. Let the Church then clear her thoughts never so much, yet all this cannot amount to a distinct Obligation to believe those things which were involved before, but to a more explicit declaring them for the Church's Peace and Satisfaction. The only Conclusion then involved in these Premises, is, that if some things may be *de fide* in one Age which were not in another, then the present Age may believe otherwise than the precedent did. And if this Doctrine be held in the Church of Rome, nothing can be more evident, than that Mr. S's first Principle of Controversie, is far from being the Doctrine of the Roman Church, which was the thing to be proved.

P. 214.

§. 13.

My second chief Argument against the way of Oral Tradition was, that it had not been owned in all Ages of the Christian Church; to manifest which, I enquired into the Reason of the Obligation in any Age of the Church to Believe and Practise just as the precedent did. Mr. S. rejoices in that Confession of mine, That only thing to be proved in this Case is, that every Age of the Church, and all Persons in it, look'd on themselves as obliged not to vary in any thing from the Doctrine and Practice of the Precedent Age. And I there offer the Choice of three ways to prove it, Reason, Testimony, or Tradition; he tells me, he excepts the way of Reason; yet quarrels with me for pressing for a Demonstrative medium to prove it, when yet Mr. S. seldom speaks under the rate of Demonstrations. But he thereby notes the unconsistency of my Carriage, Wherein I wonder? That I should desire them to perform this Promise, viz. to give us Demonstrations for the grounds of Faith? But faith withall, he will yield me the Honour of professing I have no Demonstration

but probability for the ground of mine, and he makes this serious Protestation for himself, that he should esteem himself very dishonestly, did he assert and press on others any Argument for the ground of his Faith, which he judged not evident, that is Demonstrative. What is it these Men mean when they cry up their own way for Demonstrative, and say that we build our Faith merely on Probabilities? Do they say, that Religion is capable of strict and rigorous Demonstration? If so, let them demonstrate the Being of God and Immortality of the Soul, with as much evidence, as that the three Angles of a triangle are equal to two right Angles. And it is strange, if they think Particular Problems in Religion are more capable of Demonstration than those Theorems on which they are built. But by all the enquiry I can make, all the difference between us is, that Mr. S. will have that called a Demonstration, which is scarce a Probability; and we call that sufficient Reason, which any wise Man may safely rely on in Matters of Religion. In the mean time how much do we suffer by our modesty, that because we speak not as big as Mr. S. does, we must be censured presently to have nothing but Probabilities for our Faith? Are those bare probabilities which leave no suspicion of doubt behind them? And such we freely assert the grounds of our Religion to do; *i. e.* I assert, that we have the highest Actual certainty of the truth of our Religion, which the mind of any reasonable Man can desire; and if Mr. S's Demonstrations can do any more than this, let him tell us what it is. For my part, I know nothing higher in the mind of Man than a certain assent, and if I did not think there was the greatest ground in Religion for that, I abhor dissimulation so much, that I should leave off persuading Men to embrace it. And if any Men have made us shy of the word Demonstration and Infallibility, they are such Men as Mr. S. have done it, who talk of these things, when their Arguments fall beneath some of the remotest probabilities we insist on. Nay, if there be any force in his Demonstration, as to Matter of Fact, it hath been used by us long before his Book saw the light. But we love to give the true Names to things, and not to lose our Credit with all intelligent Persons, by playing Mountebanks in Religion, crying up those things, for Infallible Cures, which an ordinary capacity may discern the insufficiency of. But was it any thing but Justice and Reason in me to expect and call for a Demonstration from them who talk of nothing under it? And therefore I said, that it was Impossible to demonstrate this way of Oral Tradition, unless it were proved impossible for Men not to think themselves obliged to believe and do all just as their Predecessors did. For where the contrary is not only possible, but easily supposable, as that Men may believe those things, as new Articles of Faith which are defined by Pope and Council, I wonder how Mr. S. will Demonstrate, that Men must look on themselves as obliged to believe just as their Predecessors did? For I had thought Demonstrations had never place in contingent Propositions; but it seems Mr. S. who tells me, *Logick will unblunder my thoughts*, intends to make a new one for me. And I assure you so he had need, before I shall ever call his Arguments Demonstrations: and although he thinks himself very honest in calling them so, yet I should think him much wiser if he did not.

But before I come to the particular debate of these things, I freely tell him, that I grant all he requests; I shall take along with me the Nature of the Matter in Hand, the Doctrines and Practices spoken of, the manner of delivering them, the necessary Circumstances which give weight to both; yet for all these, I cannot look on his way as Demonstrative. And that both our meanings may be better understood, it is very necessary the Reader should have a

O o o o

true

§. 14.

P. 236.

P. 217.

true account of the state of the Question between us. And if he will believe me, I never intended to dispute with him or any one else, whether Men were bound to wear their Clothes, or build Houses, or manage Estates just as their predecessors did; but whether every Age is obliged to believe and Practice just as the precedent did, by virtue of mere Oral Tradition; for about that is all the Controversie between us. I do not deny, but a succeeding Age may look on itself as bound to believe what the precedent did; but whether that Obligation doth arise purely from the delivery of that Doctrine by the precedent in the way of Tradition, is the thing in dispute between us. For in case the ground of Faith be wholly the written Word, conveyed from Age to Age, I deny not but an Obligation to believe descends with the Doctrine to every succeeding Age. But that which Mr. S. is to prove is, That abstractly from Scripture every Age is absolutely bound to believe just as the precedent did, without any enquiry whether that Doctrine doth agree with Scriptures or no; but that he is therefore bound to believe all which is proposed to him, because it was the Doctrine of the immediately preceeding Age. And this is that which I deny, and desire Mr. S. to prove. For which he first gives us a large instance in Historical Matters, and then comes to the Matters of Christian Faith. His instance is in Alexander's Conquest of Asia, as to which, he saith,

P. 218.

That the Memory of it is fresh and lively, though some thousand years since; and that the universal and strong persuasion of this Matter of Fact was not caused by Books, as Curtius his History, but by Human Tradition; that the continuance of this persuasion was the notoriety of the Fact to the then livers, which Obligated them to relate it to their Posterity, and that this testifying by the Fore-fathers, was that which Obligated Posterity to believe things, as true, because there could be no Imaginable Motive why the whole World should conspire to deceive them, or be receivable in their sensations; on which Principle it passed to the next Age, and so came down by way of Tradition to our days; and the Obligation to believe in every Age depended upon this, that the Senses of the first could not be deceived; and having this security in every Age, that no one would conspire to deceive the next, it follows that no Age could say a former Age testified so, unless it did; so therefore, saith he, it follows Demonstratively, that it was testified; and so the descendants in every Age to the very end of the World have the same Obligation to believe their Immediate Fore-fathers, saying it was testified by theirs, and so to the very first, who were witnesses of his Actions. This is the substance of what he more largely Discourses in several Paragraphs; which when he hath done, he tells me, he expects what I will reply to this Discourse. Not to frustrate therefore his expectation and in order to the Readers Satisfaction, we are to consider, that in the present Case there are two distinct Questions to be resolved: 1. How a Matter of Fact evident to the World comes to be conveyed to Posterity? 2. By what means a complete History of all passages relating to it may be conveyed? As to the first, I grant that a Fact so Notorious as Alexander's Conquest of Asia might have been preserved by Human Tradition, and conveyed in a certain way from one Age to another. But if we enquire into that which is alone proper to our Question, viz. by what means we may Judge what is true and false as to the particulars of that Conquest, then I deny that bare Tradition is to be relied on in this Case. For the certainty of conveyance of all particulars doth depend not upon the bare Veracity, but the Capacity and Skill of Communicating from one Age to another. For which one would think we need no clearer Evidence than the Consideration of the different account of former times in the several Nations of the World. For who can imagine, but the

P. 223.

barbarous yet more in fact and told they Acted Fact hold tion the Fac the stan gro Pr of t wri thi and the bee or c fere thu livi spi ha wi ot th no of co m C he T no T M a a in e r E F a

barbarous

barbarous Nations were as unwilling to deceive their Posterity as any other? yet we see a vast difference in the *Histories* of former Ages among them, and more civilized People. And I with Mr. S. would rather have instanced in some History which had been preserved merely by Tradition, and not in such a one, which, if any other, hath been most carefully recorded and propagated to Posterity. If Mr. S. would have undertaken to have told us, who they were that first Peopled *America*, and from what place they came, by the Tradition of the present Inhabitants, and what Famous Actions had been done there in former Ages, we might have thought indeed, that *sole Tradition* had been a very safe way to convey Matters of Fact from one Age to another. But since Mr. S's Arguments will hold as well for the *Scythians* and *Americans*, and the most barbarous Nations, as the most civil and polite; what Reason can Mr. S. give, why there is not among them as certain an account of former Ages, as among the *Greeks* and *Romans*? Were not their Senses, who saw those Matters of Fact, as incapable of being deceived as others? Was not every Age among them as unwilling to deceive their Posterity as elsewhere? Yet notwithstanding the force of Mr. S's Demonstration, we see for want of letters how grossly Ignorant they are of what was done before them. And if this Principle were true, why have we not as true an account of the eldest Ages of the World, as of any other? Nay, why were Letters invented, and writing ever used, if Tradition had been found so Infallible? But it is one thing superficially to Discourse what is Impossible should be otherwise, and another to consider what really hath been in the World. Doth not the constant experience of all times prove, that where any History hath not been timely recorded, it hath been soon corrupted by Notorious Falsities, or obscured by Fabulous Reports? As we see among ourselves, what difference there is in Point of certainty between the several stories of *K. Arthur* and *William the Conqueror*; what will Mr. S. say, that those who lived in *K. Arthur's* time could not know what he did, or that they conspired to deceive their Posterity? but if Tradition be so Infallible, why have we not the ancient story of *Britain* as exact as the modern? If Mr. S. will impute it to the Peoples Ignorance, want of Letters, frequent Conquests by other Nations, and succeeding barbarism, he may easily find how many ways there are for Matters of Fact to be soon lost or corrupted, when they have not been diligently preserved by Authentick Records; and that without one Age conspiring to deceive another. But notwithstanding Mr. S's confidence, I cannot think it possible for Mr. S. to believe, that we should have had as true an account of *Alexander's Conquest of Asia*, if *Arrian*, *Curtius*, or *Plutarch* had never writ his story, as we have now. Yet this he must Assert by virtue of his Principle. And he that can believe that, I wonder he should scruple believing the *Pope's Infallibility*; for certainly no Principle of the *Jesuits* is more wild and absurd than this is. Besides, I admire how it came into Mr. S's Head to think, no Error could come into History unless one Age conspired to deceive another, when we find no Age agreed in the present Matters of Fact which are done in it, as to the grounds and particulars of them; to give Mr. S. an Instance home to his purpose, in the late Council of *Trent* we see already what different representations there are made of it in so little a time as hath already passed since the sitting of it. One, though he had all the Advantages imaginable of knowing all proceedings in it, living at the same time, conversing with the Persons present at it, having the *Memoires* and records of the Secretaries themselves, yet his story is since endeavoured to be blasted by a great Per-

P. 213.

son of the Roman Church, as fictitious and partial. We see then it is at least supposed that Interest and Prejudice may have a great hand in abusing the World in Matter of story, though one Age never agree to deceive another. And instead of being persuaded by Mr. S's Demonstrations, I am still of the mind, that we have no sufficient security of the truth of any story, which was not written while those Persons were in being who were able to contradict the Errors of it. However I deny not, but some Notorious Matters of Fact, such as Alexander's bare Conquest of Asia, might by the visible Effects of it be preserved both in Asia and Greece for a long time. But if we come to enquire particularly, whether this or that was done by him in his Conquest, which is alone pertinent to our purpose, we have no security at all from Tradition, but only from the most Authentick records of that story. And by this, I hope Mr. S. will have cause to thank me for unblundering his thoughts (his own civil expressions,) and shewing him how Errors may come into a story without one Age conspiring to deceive the next; and what a vast difference there is between preserving a bare Matter of Fact, and all the particulars relating to it. And hereby he may easily see how far the Obligation extends in believing the report of former Ages. For there can be no Obligation to believe any farther than there is evidence of truth in the Matter we are Obligated to. If then there be not only a possibility, but a very great probability of mistakes and Errors in Matter of Fact, I pray what Obligation doth there lye upon Men absolutely to believe what is delivered by the preceeding Age? But to put an issue to this Controversie, let Mr. S. examine himself, and try if he can name one story that was never written, which was ever certainly Propagated from one Age to another by mere Oral Tradition; and if he cannot, he may thereby see how little real force his Argument hath in the World. For all the Force of Tradition lies in an unquestionable conveyance of those Books which contain in them the true reports of the Actions of the times they were written in. But can Mr. S. think, that if the Roman History had never been written, it had been possible for us to have known what was done under the Kings and Consuls as now we do? Yet if his Principle holds, this necessarily follows; for those of that Age could not but know them, and no Age since could conspire to deceive the next. And from hence, the most useful consequence of all is, that Mr. S. might have writ a History from the beginning of the World to this day, with a full relation of all particulars, if there had never been any Book written in the World before. And doth not Mr. S. deserve Immortal Credit for so rare an invention as this is, and all built on nothing short of Demonstrations?

6. 15.
P. 224.

But Mr. S. very prudently foresees, what it is I must be forced to recur to, viz. that being baffled with his former Demonstration, I have no other shift to brake my self to, but to say the Case is different between Histories and Points of Faith. And therefore to bring his business home, he applies it at large to the delivery of the Christian Faith, which that he might do in more ample sort, he very finely descants on the old Verse, *Quis, quid, ubi, &c.* containing the Circumstances of Human Actions, and from every one of them derives Arguments for the Infallibility of Oral Tradition; which briefly and in plain English may be summed up thus; Since the Author of this Doctrine was the Son of God, the Doctrine itself so excellent, and delivered in so Publick a manner, in the most convincing way, by Miracle and good Living, and for so good an end as to save Men's Souls, and that by writing it in Men's Hearts, and testified to others; and all this at a time when Men might judge of the Miracles

and

and Motives for believing it; therefore since in all these respects it was incomparably beyond the story of Alexander's Conquests, it follows, that in a weaker infinitely greater ~~must~~ the Obligation be to believe Christ's Doctrines, than Alexander's or William the Conqueror's Victories, or any History of the like nature whatsoever. All which I freely grant; but cannot yet see how from thence it follows; that Oral Tradition is the only Rule of Faith; or the means whereby we are to judge what is the Doctrine of Christ, and what not. Those Arguments I confess prove, that the Christians of the first Age were highly concerned to enquire into the truth of these things; and that they had the greatest Reason imaginable to believe them; and that it is not possible to conceive that they should not endeavour to propagate so excellent a Doctrine, and of so high concernment to the World. But the Question is, whether abstractly from the Books written in the first Age of the Christian Church, there is so much Infallibility in the Oral Tradition of every Age, that nothing could be embraced for Christ's Doctrine which was not; and consequently, whether every Age were bound to believe absolutely what was delivered in by the Precedent for the Doctrine of Christ? Mr. S. therefore puts himself to a needless task of proving that every Age was bound to believe the Doctrine of Christ, which I never Questioned; but the dispute is, whether every Age be bound on the account of Oral Tradition to believe what is delivered by the Precedent for Christ's Doctrine. But it is to be Observed all along how carefully Mr. S. avoids mentioning the written Books of the New Testament; because he knew all his game about Oral Tradition would be quite spoiled by a true stating the Matter of Fact in the first Ages of the Christian Church. I hope he will not be angry with me, for asking him that Question about the Scripture, which he asks me about the Council of Trent; Did he never hear of such a thing as the Scripture? or is it so hard to find it? But if he hath heard of it, I intreat him to resolve me these Questions: 1. Whether he doth not believe, that the Books of the New Testament were written at such a time, when the Matters of Fact therein Recorded, were capable of being thoroughly examined? which he cannot deny upon his own Principle; for Tradition being then Infallible as to the Doctrine of Christ, the writers of these Books cannot be conceived to deliver it amiss, unless they resolved to contradict the present Tradition of the Church; which if they had done, those Books could never have found any reception among Christians. If Tradition then convey the Doctrine of Christ infallibly, these Books must convey it infallibly, because they contain in them the Infalible Tradition of the first Age of the Christian Church; and were written at the time when many Persons living had been able to disprove any thing contained therein repugnant to truth. And that these Books were written by those Persons whose Names they bear, I appeal to Mr. S's own Rule, Tradition; for if that be Infalible in any thing, it must be in this; And if one Age could conspire to deceive another in a Matter of such concernment, what security can be had, that it may not do so in all other things? 2. Whether he believes, that those whose intention was to write an account of the Life, Actions, and Doctrine of Christ, did leave any thing out of their Books which did relate to them as of concernment for us to believe? For upon Mr. S's Principles, any one may easily know what the Tradition of the Church is; and especially such certainly who were either present themselves at the Matters of Fact, or heard them from those who were; and what Satisfaction can any one desire greater than this? But the Question is, whether this Testimony were not more safely deposited in the Church to be conveyed by word

word of mouth, than it could be by being committed to writing by such who were Eye and Ear witnesses of the Actions and Doctrine of Christ? Upon which I advance some farther *Queries*. 2. If Oral Tradition were the more certain way, why was any thing written at all? It may be Mr. S. will tell us, for moral instructions, and to give precepts of good Life; but then why may not these be as infallibly conveyed by Tradition as Doctrines of Faith? And why then were any Matters of Fact and Points of Faith inserted in the Books of the *New Testament*? By which it certainly appears, that the intention of writing them was to preserve them to Posterity. Let Mr. S. tell me whether it was consistent with the wisdom of Men, much less with the Wisdom of an Infinite Being to imploy Men to do that which might be far better done another way, and when it is done can give no Satisfaction to the minds of Men? 3. Whether those things which are capable of being understood when they are spoken, cease to be so when they are written? For Mr. S. seems to understand those terms of a *Living voice*, and *dead Letters* in a very strict and rigorous manner; as though the Sense were only quick when spoken, and became buried in *Dead letters*. But Mr. S. seems with the sagacious *Indian* to admire how it is possible for *dead Letters* and *unsens'd Characters* to express Mens meanings as well as words. I cannot enter into Mr. S's Apprehension, how 24 Letters by their various disposition can express Matters of Faith? And yet to increase the wonder, he writes about Matters of Faith, while he is proving that Matters of Faith cannot be conveyed by writing. So that Mr. S's own writing is the best Demonstration against himself; and he confutes his own *Sophistry* with his fingers, as *Diogenes* did *Zeno's* by his motion. For doth Mr. S. hope to persuade Men, that Tradition is a Rule of Faith by his Book or not? If not, to what purpose doth he write? If he doth, then it is to be hoped some Matters of Faith may be intelligibly conveyed by writing; especially if Mr. S. doth it. But by no means we are to believe that ever the Spirit of God can do it. For whatever is written by Men assisted by that, is according to him but a heap of *Dead Letters*, and *Insignificant Characters*; when Mr. S. the mean while is full of *Sense* and *Demonstration*. Happy Man that can thus out-do Infinite Wisdom, and write far beyond either *Prophets* or *Apostles*. But if he will condescend so far as to allow that to inspired Persons which he confidently believes of himself, viz. that he can write a Book full of *Sense*, and that any ordinary Capacity may Apprehend the design of it, our Controversie is at an end; for then Matters of Faith may be intelligibly and certainly conveyed to Posterity by the Books of *Scripture*; and if so, there will be no need of any recourse to *Oral Tradition*. 5. If the Books of *Scripture* did not certainly and intelligibly convey all Matters of Faith, what made them be received with so much Veneration in the first Ages of the *Christian Church*? which were best able to Judge of the truth of the Matters contained in them, and the usefulness of the Books themselves. And therein we still find, that Appeals were made to them, that they thought themselves concerned to Vindicate them against all Objections of Heathens and others; and the Resolution of Faith was made into them, and not Tradition, as I have already manifested, and must not repeat. 6. Whether it be in the least credible, since the Books of *Scripture* were supposed to contain the Doctrines of Faith, that every Age of the Church should look on itself as Obligated absolutely to believe the Doctrine of the Precedent by virtue of an *Oral Tradition*? For since they resolved their Faith into the written Books, how is it possible they should believe on the account

account of an Oral Tradition? Although then the *Apostles* did deliver the Doctrine of Christ to all their Disciples; yet since the Records of it were embraced in the Church, Men Judged of the truth or falshood of Doctrines, by the conveniency or repugnancy of them to what was contained in those Books. By which we understand, that the Obligation to believe what was taught by the Precedent Age, did not arise from the Oral Tradition of it, but by the satisfaction of the present Age, that the Doctrine delivered by it, was the same with that contained in *Scripture*.

It is time now to return to Mr. S. who proceeds still to manifest the Obligation in Posterity to believe what was delivered as matter of Faith, by the Precedent Age of the Church; but the force of all is the same still; *viz.* that otherwise one Age must conspire to deceive the next. But the inconsequence of that, I have fully shewed already, unless he Demonstrates it impossible for Errors to come in any other way: For if we reduce the substance of what he saith to a Syllogistical form, it comes to this; Where there is no possibility of Error, there is an absolute Obligation to Faith; but there is no possibility of Error in the Tradition of any Age of the Church: *viz.* in every Age there is an absolute Obligation to believe the Tradition of the present Church. The *minor* he thus proves; If no Age of the Church can be Ignorant of what the Precedent taught, or conspire to deceive the next; then there is no possibility of Error coming into the Tradition of the Church in any Age; but the Antecedent is true, and therefore the consequent. Now, who sees not that the force of all this lies not in proving the *minor Proposition*, or that no Age could conspire to deceive another? but the consequence, *viz.* that no Error can come into a Church, but by a general mistake, in one whole Age, or the general imposture of it which we utterly deny; and have shewed him already the falseness of it from his own concessions. And I might more largely shew it from those Doctrines or Opinions which they themselves Acknowledge to have come into their Church without any such general mistake or Imposture, as the Doctrines of Papal Infallibility, and the common belief of Purgatory. The very same way that Mr. White and Mr. S. will shew us how these came in, we will shew him how many others came in as Erroneous and Scandalous as those are. For whether they account these Matters of Faith or no, it is certain many among them do, and that the far greatest number, who assert and believe them to be the Doctrine of their Church too. If therefore these might come in without one Age mistaking or deceiving the next, why might not all those come in the same way which we charge upon them as the Errors of their Church? And in the same manner that Corrupt Doctrines come in, may Corrupt Practices too, since these, as he saith, *spring from the other*. He might therefore have saved himself the trouble of finding out how an accurate Wit, or great Scholar would discover the weakness of this way. For without pretending to be either of these, I have found out another way of Attacking it, than Mr. S. looked for; *viz.* from his own Principles and Concessions; shewing how Errors might come into a Church, without a total Deception or Conspiracy in any one Age. Which if it be true, he cannot bind me to believe whatever he tells me the present Church delivers, unless he can prove that this never came into the Church as a Speculation or private Opinion, and from thence by degrees hath come to be accounted a Point of Faith. Therefore his way of proof is now quite altered, and he cannot say we are bound to believe whatever the present Church delivers; for that which he calls the present Church, may have admitted Speculations and private Opinions into Doctrines

§. 16.

P. 229, &c.

P. 231.

Strines of Faith; but he must first prove such Doctrines delivered by Christ or his Apostles, and that from his time down to our Age they have been received by the whole Church for Matters of Faith; and when he hath done this, as to any of the Points in Controversie between us, I will Promise him to be his *Profelyte*. But he ought still to remember, that he is not to prove it impossible for one whole Age to conspire to deceive the next; but that supposing that it is impossible for any Errors to come into the Tradition of the Church. Let us now see what Mr. S. Objects against those words I then used against the Demonstrating this way; *It is hard to conceive what Reason should enforce it, but such as proves the impossibility of the contrary; and they have Understandings of another mould from others, who can conceive it impossible Men should not think themselves obliged to believe and do all just as their Predecessors.* And whatever Mr. S. says to the contrary, I cannot yet see, but that therein I argued from the very nature and constitution of the thing. For that which I looked for, was a *Demonstration*, which I supposed could not be unless the impossibility of the contrary were Demonstrated. But if it be possible for Men, *Christians*, nay *Romanists*, to believe on other accounts than Tradition of the Precedent Age, I pray what Demonstration can there be, that Men must think themselves obliged to believe and do all just as their Predecessors did? Surely if Mr. S's Fancy had not been very extravagant, he could never have thought here of *Mens being obliged to cut their Beards, or wear such Garters and Hat-bands as their Fore-fathers did.* For do not I mention *believing first, and then doing?* by which it were easie to Apprehend, that I meant Matters of Faith, and such Practices as flow from them. Neither was there any such *Crafty and Sophistical Dealing* as he charges me with; for I am content his Doctrine be taken in his own terms; and I have now given a larger and fuller Account why I am far from being convinced by the way he hath used for resolving Faith. Passing by therefore his challenge, which I accept of, as long as he holds to the *Weapon of Reason and Civility*, I come to consider his last enquiry, *why I should come to doubt of such an Obligation in Posterity, to believe their Ancestors in Matters of Faith;* and he judiciously resolves it into *a strange distortion of Human Nature*, but such as it seems is the proper effect of the *Protestants Temper*, which is, saith he, *to chuse every one his Faith by his private Judgment, or Wit, working upon disputable words.* Which as far as we own it, is not to believe what we see no ground for; and if this be such a *distortion of Human Nature*, I envy not Mr. S's Uprightness and Perfection. If he means that we build our Faith on our private Judgments, in opposition to *Scripture*, or the *Universal Tradition* of the Church in all Ages, let him prove it evidently in one particular, and I engage for my self and all true *Protestants*, we will renounce the belief of it. If he hath any thing farther to object against the grounds of our Religion, he knows where to Attack me; let him undertake the whole, or else acknowledge it a most unreasonable thing thus to charge Falsities upon us, and then say we have nothing else to say for ourselves. We pretend not to chuse our Faith, but heartily embrace whatever appears to have been delivered by *Christ* or his *Apostles*; but we know the Church of *Rome* too well to believe all which she would impose upon us, and are loth to have her chuse our Religion for us, since we know she hath chosen so ill for herself. But if Mr. S. will not believe me in saying thus, what Reason have I to believe him in saying otherwise? Such general charges then signifie nothing, but every one must Judge according to the Reason on both sides.

I now come to the last part of my task; which is to shew, that this way is repugnant to common Sense and Experience, and that the Church of Rome hath apparently altered from what was the belief of former Ages. To which purpose my words are, It is to no Purpose to prove impossibility of motion when I see Men move; no more is it to prove, that no Age of the Church could vary from the Preceding, when we can evidently prove that they have done it. And therefore this Argument is intended only to catch easie Minds that care not for a search into the History of the several Ages of the Church, but had rather sit down with a superficial Subtilty, than spend time in farther enquiries. But two things Mr. S. tells me are required e'er I can see that their Faith varies from the former; first to see what their Church holds now, and then to see what the former Church held before; and he kindly tells me, if he sees any thing, I see neither well. It seems I want Mr. S's Spectacles of Oral Tradition to see with; but as yet I have no cause to complain of the want of them, but I see much better without them than with them. He tells me, I cannot see what their present Church holds, and therefore I cannot assure any what was held before; because, if I renounce Tradition, I take away all means of knowing. The Reason why I cannot candidly see (as he phrases it) what their Church holds now, is, because I cannot distinguish between Faith and its Explication, some Schoolmen and the Church. By which it seems it is impossible for me to know what their Church holds concerning Invocation of Saints, Worship of Images, Communion in one kind; for those are the Points I there mention, wherein it is evident, that the Church of Rome hath receded from the Doctrine and Practice of the Primitive Church. Or are these only the Opinions and Practices of some Schoolmen among them, and not the Doctrine and Practice of their Church? But we might come to some fuller state of these Controversies, I wish Mr. S. would settle some sure way whereby we might know distinctly what are the Doctrines and Practices of their Church. If the Council of Trent and Roman Catechism be said to be the Rule of Doctrine, I desire no other; so that those may be interpreted by Practices universally allowed among them. As when that Council only defined, that due Honour be given to Saints; the general Practice of that Church may tell us what they mean by that due Honour; and if that be not fair, I know not what is. But I see all the shift Mr. S. hath, is, when he is pinched, to say these are the Opinions of Schoolmen and private Speculators, and not the Doctrine of their Church. And if such shifts as these are must serve the turn, I should wonder if ever he be to seek for an Answer. But the shortest Answer of all would be, that none but those of their Church can know what she holds; and therefore it is to no purpose for Protestants to write against her; or it may be, that none but Mr. S. and one or two more can tell; for many among them say, those are the Doctrines of their Church which they deny to be. So that except Mr. White and Mr. S. and some very few Demonstrators more, all the rest are Schoolmen, private Opiniators, and not to be relied on. But I cannot see what their Church held formerly neither. No wonder at all of that; for if I cannot see an Object so near me as the present Church, how can it be expected I should see one so much farther off as the Doctrine of former Ages? And his reason is so strong, as may well perswade me out of one, at least, of my Five Senses. For, saith he, if I Question Tradition, I Question whether there be any Doctrine delivered, and so any Fathers. And is not this argued like a Demonstrator? First he supposes there never was any way used in the World but Oral Tradition, and then strongly infers, if I deny that, I can know nothing. But I can yet hardly perswade my self that the Fathers

P. 238.

P. 236.

P P P P

only

only fate in Chimney-Corners teaching their Children by word of Mouth, and charging them to be sure to do so to theirs; but as they loved preserving the Doctrine of Faith, they should have a great care never to write down a word of it. But why, I wonder, should Mr. S. think that if I do not allow of Oral Tradition, I must needs Question whether there were any Fathers? I had thought I might have known there had been Fathers by their Children? I mean the Books they left behind them. But if all Mr. S. pleads for be only this, that no Books can be certainly conveyed without Tradition, he disputes without an Adversary; But as I never opposed this, so I am sure it doth him little service. It is then from the Books of the Fathers that I find what the Sense of the Church of their Age was, and from thence I have shewed how vastly different the Opinions and Practices of the *Roman Church* are from those of the *Primitive*. Although then I may not think myself obliged to believe all that the present Church delivers for matter of Faith; yet I hope I may find what the Opinions and Practice of the former Church were by the Records that are left of it. And the Reason why I cannot think any one obliged to believe what every Age of the Church delivers, is, because I think no Man obliged to believe Contradictions; and I see the Opinions and Practices of several Ages apparently contrary to each other.

§. 18.

Well, but I call this way a *Superficial Subtlety*; and so I think it still; so little have Mr. S's Demonstrations wrought upon me. But, faith he, *is that which is wholly built on the nature of things Superficial?* No; but that which pretends to be so built, may. And of that nature I have shewed this way to be, and not the former. But that I may not think him *Superficial* as well as his way, he puts a profound Question to me, *What do I think Controversie is?* and that he may the better let me know what it is, he Answers himself. *I deal plainly with you, faith he, you may take it to be an Art of Talking, and I think you do so, though you will not profess it; but I take it to be a Noble Science.* But to let him see that I will deal as plainly with him, as he doth with me, I will profess it, that I not only think *Controversie* as usually managed, but some Mens way of Demonstrating (Mr. S. may easily know whom I mean) to be a mere *Art of Talking*, and nothing else. But he takes it to be a *Noble Science*; yes doubtless, if Mr. S. manage it, and he be the judge of it himself. His meaning I suppose is, by his following words, *that he goes upon certain Principles, and we do not.* We have already seen how certain his Principles have been, and I should be somewhat ashamed of my Religion if I had no better. But what our Rule of Faith is, hath been amply Discoursed already by you, and that in Mr. S's clearing Method, that nothing is left for me to do, but to touch at what remains, and concludes this Answer. I had the better to illustrate the weakness of that Argument from Oral Tradition, brought an instance in that Case parallel, viz. that if one Ages delivering to another would prove that the Faith of Christ was in every Age unalterable, because no Age did testify any such alteration to be in it; by the same Argument the World might be proved eternal, because no Age did ever testify to another, that the World was ever otherwise than it is. So that if Oral Tradition were only to be relied on, there could be no evidence given of the Worlds being ever otherwise than it is, and consequently the World must be believed to have been always what we see it is. This, as far as I can Apprehend, is a clear and distinct Ratiocination, and purposely designed to prove that we must admit of other Rules to judge of Alterations in the Church by, besides Oral Tradition. But Mr. S. (in his

P. 240.

OWN

P. 241.

P. 242.

P. 243.

§. 19.

own Expression) strangely differing from the Mark I aimed at, professes there is not a Tittle in it parallel to his Medium, nay, that he never saw in his Life more Absurdities conched in fewer Words. But I must take all patiently from a Man who still Perches on the Specific Nature of things, and never steps below the Sphere of Science. Yet by his good leave, he either Apprehends not, or wilfully mistakes my meaning; for my Argument doth not proceed upon the belief of the Worlds Eternity, which, in his Answer, he runs wholly upon as far as Eighthly and Lastly, but upon the evidence of Oral Tradition as to no discernable alteration in any Age of it. For the Question between us, is, whether in Matters of alteration in the Faith or Practice of the Church, we are bound to rely only on the Testimony of Oral Tradition; so that if no Age can be instanced in wherein any Alteration was made, and this delivered by that Age, then we are bound to believe there hath been no Alteration since Christ and the Apostles times; now I say, if this hold good, I will prove the World Eternal by the same Argument; taking this for our Principle, that we are bound to rely only on Oral Tradition in the Case, Originally derived from the Matter of Fact seen by those of the first Age; for that which never was otherwise than it is, is Eternal; but we cannot know by Oral Tradition that the World ever was otherwise than it is; for no Age of the World can be instanced in, wherein we have any Testimony of any Alteration that was in it. Either then we must believe that the World ever was what it is, i. e. Eternal; or else we must say, that we are not to rely barely on Oral Tradition in this Case, but we must judge whether the World were made or no, by other Mediums of Scripture and Reason. And this was all which I aimed at, viz. to shew that where there is no evidence from Oral Tradition; yet if there be Scripture and Reason, there is sufficient ground for our Faith to stand upon. And so I apply it to the present Case; though we could not prove barely from the Tradition of any one Age, that there had been any Alteration in the Faith or Practice of the Church; yet if I can prove that there hath been such from Scripture and Reason, this is sufficient for me to believe it. And now I dare appeal to the indifferent Reader, whether this be so full of Absurdities, or it be such a rambling Chimerical Argument (as he calls it,) no two Pieces of which hang together with themselves, or any thing else. Which being expressions of as great Modesty as Science, I am content Mr S. should bear away the Honour of them and his Demonstrations together.

The last thing he quarrels with me for, is, that I say, if we can evidently prove, that there have been Alterations in the Church, then it is to no purpose to prove that impossible which we see Actually done. And this appears not only because the Scripture supposes a Degeneracy in the Christian Church, which could never be, if every Age of the Church did Infallibly believe and Practice as the Precedent up to Christ's Time did; but because we can produce clear evidence that some things are delivered by the present Church, which must be brought in by some Age since the time of Christ; for which I refer the Reader to what I had said about Communion in one kind, Invocation of Saints, and Worship of Images: In all which, I say, I had proved evidently that they were not in use in some Ages of the Christian Church; and it is as evident that these are delivered by the present Church, and therefore this Principle must needs be false. In Answer to this, Mr. S. wishes, I would tell him first what Evidence means, whether a strong Fancy, or a Demonstration? I mean that which is enough to persuade a wise Man, who judges according to the clearest Reason, which I am sure is more than ever his Demonstrations will do. But it is a pleasant

spectacle to see how Mr. S. lays about him, at my saying that the *Scripture* supposes a Degeneracy in the Christian Church. *Incomparably argued!* faith he, *why, see we not the place? Does it evidently speak of Faith, or Manners, the Universal Church, or particular Persons? but be it in Faith, be it Universal, does it suppose this Degeneracy already past, which is only proper to your purpose, or yet to come? That is, does it say there must be a total Apostasie in Faith before the Year 1664? Alas, he had forgot this.* Most incomparably Answered! For if the Degeneracy be in 1665. or any Years after, what becomes of Mr. S's Demonstration then, that no Errors could come into the Church but it seems his Demonstration holds but till 1664. and I easily believe another Year will never believe the truth of it. But if such a thing as a Degeneracy be possible, how then stands the Infallibility of Tradition, when there can be no Degeneracy without falling from the Doctrine and Practices of *Christ* and his *Apostles*? But that such a Degeneracy hath already been in that which calls itself the *Catholick Church*, and that both in Faith and Manners, I shall refer Mr. S. to the Learned Author of the late *Idea of Antichristianism* and *Synopsis Prophetica*, where he may find enough to perswade him that his Demonstration was far from holding so long as 1664. And now I leave the Reader to judge whether the foregoing Evidences against the Infallibility of *Oral Tradition*, or Mr. S's Demonstrations have the greater force of Reason in them. And if he will not *stoop* so far from the *height* of his *Perch*, as to take notice of what I have elsewhere said, I am resolved to let him see I am not at all concerned about it: I begin to understand him so well by this *Appendix*, that I can give my self a reasonable Account why he thought it not fit to meddle with any other part of my Book. But if Mr. *Serjeant*. be resolved not to Answer any of the Testimonies I there produce, unless I *single them out, and print them at the end of this Answer*, (*i. e.* remove them from that evidence which attends them in the *Series* of the Discourse) I can only say, he is the most imperious Answerer I have met with, who is resolved never to deal with an Adversary, but on his own unreasonable Terms. Thus heartily wishing Mr. S's Science as great as his Opinion of it, and a good effect of our Endeavours to promote the one, by removing the other, I am

P. 244.

D 5

Sir,

Your Affectionate Friend

and Servant,



Edward Stillingfleet.

F I N I S.

ip-
d!
rs,
al,
se,
ore
d!
of
ch
ve
s a
on,
nd
al-
oth
he
e-
fo
re-
De-
will
I
rn-
t I
ed-
ed
gle
om
on-
re-
ble
on
ov-

5